

claims of the eastern and emigrant and western Cherokee Indians and Creek and Seminole Indians of Indian Territory, now Oklahoma, for any moneys, lands, and interest found due said Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 14389) for the relief of contractors under supervision of the War Department for losses which have arisen under contracts entered into between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 14390) to amend the interstate commerce act, as amended by the transportation act, 1920, to require carriers to supply necessary warehouse facilities and extend the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 14391) to make Newark, N. J., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 14409) to amend section 11 of chapter 517 of the act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, and to extend and enlarge the time for taking appeals and suing out writs of error in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 14410) to allow credit for all supplies issued and funds disbursed by officers of the Army, under direction of the President, for relief of sufferers of the flood at Corpus Christi, Tex., in September, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 585) asking that the American Government make a friendly request of the British Parliament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: Resolution (H. Res. 586) urging an early decision by the Labor Board on the adjustment of wages of railroad employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EAGAN: Resolution (H. Res. 587) urging an early decision by the Railroad Labor Board on the adjustment of wages of railroad employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 375) restricting the distribution among the several States of Federal appropriations for highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. HAMIL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 376) for the appointment of a special committee to investigate conditions in Ukrainian East Galicia, to the end that supplies of medicine, food, and clothing may be sent to relieve the intense distress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 14392) granting a pension to George W. Grey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 14393) granting a pension to Sarah Elizabeth Cottrell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 14394) granting a pension to Josephine Olson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14395) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. and Junietta Dawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 14396) granting a pension to Eliza J. Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARLAND: A bill (H. R. 14397) granting a pension to Elizabeth Corbly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14398) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie K. Thorpe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 14399) for the relief of Matthew H. Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14400) for the relief of Frank J. De Bolt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 14401) granting a pension to Eugene F. Rose; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUHRING: A bill (H. R. 14402) granting a pension to John D. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLANE: A bill (H. R. 14403) for the relief of Anthony Murphy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 14404) granting a pension to Rose Anne Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 14405) granting a pension to Flora McMann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 14406) granting a pension to Elizabeth Borden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14407) granting a pension to Rhoda Meacham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 14408) granting an increase of pension to Bruce E. Townsend; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4078. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of New York, favoring increased postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4079. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of Flour City Lodge, No. 959, International Association of Machinists' helpers, Minneapolis, Minn., favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4080. Also, petition of International Association of Machinists, Local No. 647, Two Harbors, Minn., favoring a repeal of the war-time sedition law and amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4081. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Merchants' Association of New York, favoring increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4082. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Resolutions of the Ingham County (Mich.) Rural Carriers' Association, relative to increased compensation for rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4083. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, urging release of political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4084. By Mr. McGLENNON: Petition of Hat Finishers' Union, Local No. 14, of Newark, N. J., favoring increase in postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4085. Also, petition of Rotary Club, of Bayonne, N. J., favoring increased salaries for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4086. By Mr. BAKER: Petition of George J. Hecht, editor of Better Times, New York City, urging adequate appropriations for Bureau of Naturalization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4087. Also, petition of Llewelyn Iron Works, of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against bonus for ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4088. Also, petition of Federal Employees' Union, of Mare Island Navy Yard, Calif., urging appropriation to keep correct records of Reclassification Commission; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

4089. Also, petition of Tobacco Merchants' Association of the United States protesting against proposed tax on tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4090. Also, petition of John F. Armstrong, Chico Chamber of Commerce, W. C. Busse, California Branch, National League of Postmasters, and Harry A. Chapman, all of California, urging an increase in postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4091. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Eugene R. Kelley, M. D., opposing the passage of House bill 13726; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4092. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts favoring increased salaries for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4093. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of American citizens of Ukrainian descent of Pittsfield, Mass., asking for a commission to investigate and relieve sufferings in East Galicia and Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### SENATE.

FRIDAY, June 4, 1920.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 2, 1920.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

#### GOVERNMENT OF ITALY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has received a communication from the Italian Ambassador at Washington, which will be inserted in the RECORD.

The communication is as follows:

ROYAL ITALIAN EMBASSY,  
Washington, May 31, 1920.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I have been directed by Mr. Scialoja to express to you as President of the United States

Senate and beg you to convey to the Members of the Senate His Majesty's Government's sentiments of deep appreciation for the resolution commemorating the anniversary of Italy's entrance into the war, introduced by Senator KING, and agreed to by the Senate on the 24th instant.

Nothing could have been more welcome to the Italian people than this message of sympathy from the Senate of the Great American Nation, towards which every Italian has feelings of admiration and friendship.

Whilst taking pleasure in carrying out the instructions I have received, I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to you, my dear Mr. Vice President, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Yours, very sincerely,

ROMANO AVEZZANA.

His Excellency the Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,  
President of the United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

#### EMPLOYEES OF AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting in response to resolution of March 8, 1920, certain data relative to the number of employees of the Department of Agriculture and their classification as to employment, residence, and pay. The communication will be inserted in the Record and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The communication is as follows:

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE. Washington, June 3, 1920.

SIR: In compliance with Senate resolution 327, dated March 8, 1920, I have the honor to transmit herewith statements showing the number of persons employed in the Department of Agriculture, together with a division of such employees into classes with the number employed in each class, which classification shows separately the number of persons employed as scientists and experts, the number of persons employed in the District of Columbia and in each of the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the number of persons employed in the Department of Agriculture separately for each year for the 10 years last past, the total appropriations and deficiencies separately for each of the 10 fiscal years last past, the amount and percentage of such appropriations used for expenditures other than for salaries, wages, traveling expenses, and office expenses, and the character of such expenditures.

Respectfully,

E. T. MEREDITH, Secretary.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

#### STATEMENT No. 1.

##### 1. Number of employees, by classes, on Mar. 1, 1920.

Executive and administrative.....	1,406
Clerical.....	3,103
Subclerical.....	1,958
Scientists and experts.....	12,237
Total.....	18,704

##### 2. Number of employees (all classes), by States, on Mar. 1, 1920.

Alabama.....	221
Arizona.....	208
Arkansas.....	236
California.....	768

<sup>1</sup> In addition there are a total of 1,800 river and rainfall, storm-warning, cotton-region observers, and other emergency assistants in the Weather Bureau; forest guards, fire assistants, rodmen, chainmen, cooks, patrolmen, etc., in the Forest Service; and scouts, foremen, and laborers employed in connection with the eradication of the brown-tail and gypsy moth in the New England States. These persons are not included in the total of 18,704 employees, because their employment is of an emergency or intermittent character.

STATEMENT No. 3.—Showing total appropriations and deficiencies separately for each of the 10 fiscal years last past, the amount and percentage of such appropriations used for expenditures other than salaries, wages, traveling expenses, and office expenses, and the character of such expenditures.

	Total appropriations, exclusive of deficiency appropriations.	Deficiency appropriations.	Telegraph, telephone, and postage.	Freight, express, and drayage.	Furnishing heat, light, power, electricity, fuel.	Apparatus, instruments, laboratory and miscellaneous equipment.	Forage purchased in bulk.	Engineers', electricians', and mechanics' supplies.
1910.....	\$16,626,736.00	\$30,000.00	\$208,692.15	\$36,660.82	\$10,757.01	\$677,482.58	\$84,176.70	\$7,736.41
1911.....	17,242,636.00	923,192.00	216,670.87	44,080.78	10,032.28	906,410.83	150,603.97	5,477.96
1912.....	20,110,016.00		231,452.13	70,118.63	11,824.03	743,472.39	164,918.78	4,925.24
1913.....	19,681,496.00	5,819.83	228,760.46	88,603.81	13,411.64	532,516.00	211,010.23	24,062.89
1914.....	21,746,945.00		247,665.26	103,864.80	11,903.55	553,474.75	175,405.63	35,955.27
1915.....	23,345,832.00		262,875.67	148,922.76	10,990.59	602,714.80	211,173.50	26,787.67
1916.....	27,051,782.00	2,884,243.00	281,271.17	113,700.54	9,880.95	506,274.20	193,640.76	27,900.70
1917.....	29,528,852.00	452,300.00	330,380.15	135,908.86	10,499.30	599,867.47	259,298.17	13,274.27
1918.....	46,355,513.00	775,000.00	491,082.88	209,193.56	13,789.52	759,480.32	302,920.90	15,389.02
1919.....	44,487,216.00		530,881.61	213,997.58	17,071.43	863,185.40	336,179.46	12,908.31

<sup>1</sup> Includes emergency war appropriation of \$15,346,400 for increasing food production.

<sup>2</sup> Includes emergency war appropriation of \$11,031,863 for increasing food production; discontinued July 1, 1919.

Colorado.....	472
Connecticut.....	64
Delaware.....	20
District of Columbia.....	4,465
Florida.....	294
Georgia.....	329
Idaho.....	313
Illinois.....	843
Indiana.....	292
Iowa.....	409
Kansas.....	439
Kentucky.....	141
Louisiana.....	331
Maine.....	54
Maryland.....	300
Massachusetts.....	348
Michigan.....	243
Minnesota.....	378
Mississippi.....	251
Missouri.....	360
Montana.....	469
Nebraska.....	358
Nevada.....	80
New Hampshire.....	55
New Jersey.....	171
New Mexico.....	298
New York.....	648
North Carolina.....	268
North Dakota.....	124
Ohio.....	368
Oklahoma.....	255
Oregon.....	423
Pennsylvania.....	301
Rhode Island.....	47
South Carolina.....	174
South Dakota.....	151
Tennessee.....	202
Texas.....	643
Utah.....	327
Vermont.....	75
Virginia.....	347
Washington.....	333
West Virginia.....	136
Wisconsin.....	411
Wyoming.....	143
Hawaii.....	28
Philippines.....	7
Porto Rico.....	25
Alaska.....	29
Guam.....	6
Virgin Islands.....	4
Canal Zone.....	1
Foreign.....	14

Total employees in department.....<sup>1</sup> 18,704

#### STATEMENT No. 2.—The number of persons employed separately for each year for 10 years last past.

July 1, 1910.....	12,480	July 1, 1915.....	16,223
July 1, 1911.....	12,704	July 1, 1916.....	17,167
July 1, 1912.....	13,858	July 1, 1917.....	18,751
July 1, 1913.....	14,478	July 1, 1918.....	25,239
July 1, 1914.....	16,061	July 1, 1919.....	22,967

<sup>1</sup> In addition there are a total of 1,800 river and rainfall, storm-warning, cotton-region observers, and other emergency assistants in the Weather Bureau; forest guards, fire assistants, rodmen, chainmen, cooks, patrolmen, etc., in the Forest Service; and scouts, foremen, and laborers employed in connection with the eradication of the brown-tail and gypsy moth in the New England States. These persons are not included in the total of 18,704 employees, because their employment is of an emergency or intermittent character.

<sup>2</sup> Includes temporary employees such as river and rainfall, storm-warning, cotton-region observers, and other emergency assistants in the Weather Bureau; forest guards, fire assistants, rodmen, chainmen, cooks, patrolmen, etc., in the Forest Service; and scouts, foremen, and laborers employed in connection with the eradication of the brown-tail and gypsy moth in the New England States, numbering about 1,800.



STATEMENT NO. 3.—Showing total appropriations and deficiencies separately for each month of the 10 fiscal years last past, the amount and percentage of such appropriations used for expenditures other than salaries, wages, traveling expenses, and office expenses, and the character of such expenditures—Continued.

	Purchase of animals for experimental and control purposes.	Advertising and publication of notices.	Lands purchased.	Printing, engraving, lithographing, and binding.	Structures and other improvements of lands.	Miscellaneous supplies, services, etc.	Total.	Percentage.
1910.....	\$38,356.09	\$306.15	\$26,300.00	\$61,453.84	\$35,591.53	\$552,258.47	\$1,739,769.75	10.41
1911.....	39,072.50	298.14	.....	72,996.04	89,778.57	591,248.72	2,126,671.26	11.71
1912.....	36,005.67	254.51	17,775.00	54,572.50	99,618.42	570,125.69	2,005,062.99	9.97
1913.....	30,322.49	270.01	11,873.70	100,746.17	76,928.78	349,163.73	1,667,669.91	8.47
1914.....	76,978.23	848.53	17,380.00	112,325.56	111,872.77	357,807.32	1,805,481.67	8.30
1915.....	2,690,439.27	1,082.40	31,500.00	103,664.28	114,390.96	639,097.18	4,843,639.08	20.74
1916.....	329,546.05	415.00	13,000.00	121,256.69	83,047.87	398,227.13	2,075,161.06	6.94
1917.....	61,566.02	1,376.11	1,709.15	155,652.24	114,149.15	522,700.48	2,206,381.57	7.35
1918.....	42,389.83	719.63	46,910.00	678,271.56	169,202.73	590,110.90	3,319,400.75	7.04
1919.....	123,777.66	629.46	.....	453,614.06	41,140.86	814,589.55	3,407,975.41	7.65

## STATEMENT NO. 4.

[Memorandum.]

## DEFINITION OF CLASSES.

Executive and administrative: Employees whose duties are mainly of a supervisory, executive, or administrative character, such as chiefs of divisions, chief clerks, executive assistants, officials in charge of large field stations, administrative assistants, and the like.

Clerical: Employees whose duties are mainly of a clerical character, such as clerks of classes 1, 2, 3, and 4, stenographers, typewriters, statistical clerks, bookkeepers, auditors, and the like.

Subclerical: Employees of the various grades below that of clerk, such as mechanics, messengers, messenger boys, laborers, charwomen, janitors, watchmen, and the like.

Scientists and experts: Employees engaged in scientific, research, professional, technical, and expert work of the department, such as meteorologists, forecasters, veterinary inspectors, animal husbandmen, botanists, plant pathologists, silviculturists, wood technologists, chemists, microanalysts, soil physicists, soil chemists, entomologists, apiculturists, biologists, experts in game conservation, statisticians, crop specialists, extension specialists, agriculturists, highway engineers, supervisors of road construction, grain supervisors, cotton specialists, insecticide and fungicide inspectors, plant quarantine inspectors, and the like.

## EXPENDITURES.

It should be noted that in addition to the amounts turned back into the Treasury from the regular appropriations during the decade covered by this report, there were unexpended balances, also turned back into the Treasury, of about \$10,400,000 in the emergency war appropriations for increasing food production during the fiscal years 1918 and 1919.

## SPECIAL DELIVERY FEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a letter from the Postmaster General, submitting deficiency estimates of appropriations in the sum of \$166.56 required for the payment of special delivery fees for the fiscal years 1918 and 1919, which, with accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$20,000 required by the Department of State to defray the expenses of American delegates to the General Assembly of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14338) to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. STEENERSON, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. MOON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14335) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GOON, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 10011. An act authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish monthly statistics concerning hides, skins, and leather;

H. R. 13978. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near McKees Rocks Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

H. R. 14208. An act to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 13587. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14101. An act providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act; and

H. R. 14384. An act to amend the penal laws of the United States.

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 10011. An act authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish monthly statistics concerning hides, skins, and leather was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Census.

H. R. 13978. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near McKees Rocks Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 14208. An act to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented memorials of the president, faculty, and students of Harvard University, Cambridge; of the faculty of Simmons College, Boston; and of the Empire Day Festival Association of Boston, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the recognition of the Republic of Ireland, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to amend the patent laws, which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, favoring the expulsion of the Turks from Europe and also for the protection of the Armenians, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the recognition of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted at the annual convention of the Diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church of New York, favoring nonaction by Congress in regard to Ireland tending to impair the good relations which exist between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chanute, Kans., and a petition of the Thrasher and Tractor Club of Wichita, Kans., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of maternity and infancy, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KNOX presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interference with commerce, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Frank F. Sullivan Post No. 198, American Legion, of Delaware County, Pa., praying for the granting of a bonus for ex-service men, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the granting of a cash bonus to able-bodied soldiers and sailors and favoring ample provision for all wounded and disabled ex-service men; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have received a large number of telegrams and communications from citizens of my State relative to the coal situation in New England, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD. Later in the day I shall endeavor to get an opportunity to call up the resolution offered by me on this subject.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MELROSE, MASS., June 4, 1920.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Coal situation very serious. Heartily approve of your effort for embargo as only protection for New England industries.

CHAS. H. ADAMS, Mayor.

MALDEN, MASS., June 4, 1920.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,  
Washington, D. C.:

May I urge that you take some action to stop exporting of coal? Condition here in New England becoming serious on this account.

JOHN V. KIMBALL, Mayor.

BOSTON, MASS., June 3, 1920.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,  
United States Senate, Washington:

We are facing a very serious situation at our mill for want of coal to operate our plant. New England needs the coal that is being exported. Prices are prohibitive on the small supply left. Do something to help us.

STANDARD HORSESHOE CO.

LEE, MASS., June 3, 1920.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We hope you are making progress with your bill to restrict the exportation of coal.

We operate limekilns at Lee, Mass., and Canaan, Conn., and are not able to buy coal from West Virginia, which quality of gas coal we need to burn our lime satisfactorily. During the Government control of coal prices we paid \$2.60 per ton at the mines. Now we can not buy gas coal at \$8.50 at the mines.

If the prosperity of this country is to be maintained, it will be necessary to adjust matters so that manufacturers can have sufficient fuel to operate their plants.

Very truly, yours,

THE LEE LIME CO.,  
By M. H. DEELY,

SOUTH GARDNER, MASS., June 1, 1920.

United States Senator DAVID I. WALSH,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are deeply interested in the stand that you have taken in trying to care for the requirements of New England, which is suffering a great deal at the present time for want of coal.

We use in connection with the waste from our woodworking plants 16 to 20 carloads of coal yearly. Most of the coal we use during the winter. This last fall we had five carloads in stock and have not been able to procure but a part of a car since that time. We have had a number of shipments made, but they were all taken over by the railroad companies in transit.

On account of not having coal enough, we have not been able to run our dry kilns to dry up stock enough to take care of anywhere near our normal business, which is the manufacturing of baby carriages, doll carriages, and children's chairs. We barely had coal enough to keep our heating apparatus going. We have only one-third of our normal help, on account of not having the dry stock.

We have orders in with four different coal jobbers, and we had a notice from one of them last week stating that he had been offered \$8 per ton for coal at the mines.

The stand you have taken in the interest of New England we wish to thank you for and hope that you will succeed in making some arrangement to allow the manufacturers to procure their former share of this product.

Again wishing you success in your undertaking, we remain,

Very truly, yours,

L. B. RAMSDELL CO.,  
By THOMAS E. CODY,  
President.

BOSTON, MASS., May 28, 1920.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to call your attention to the unfortunate situation in New England as regards coal supply and urge upon you the desirability of doing everything in your power to bring about an embargo on export coal.

When the Hon. James J. Storrow retired as fuel administrator for New England he stated that unless an export embargo was placed on coal New England would have to bid against the world for its fuel supply, and this is just what has happened, and we are being quoted prices of from \$8 to \$9 per ton f. o. b. mines on gas or steam coal.

Not only are we being asked these excessive prices but we are unable to get delivery, due to inadequate transportation facilities.

The coal-producing regions are filled with foreign buyers, who are bidding against the market for coal for foreign shipments, and the coal-carrying steamers which usually carry coal from tidewater to the New England coast are engaged in carrying coal to foreign ports.

It is impossible at this time to secure sufficient coal to keep New England's industries operating without interruptions, and if these conditions are allowed to continue it is bound to result in much suffering and unemployment in this section during the coming fall and winter.

I am purchasing agent for 21 gas and electric lighting companies in Massachusetts, and we are having extreme difficulty in keeping these plants in operation.

Our coal supply at several of the plants is dangerously low, and we are unable to feel assured of their continuous operation.

We have been dangerously near a shutdown several times during the past month and unless immediate relief is secured we can see no prospects of any improvement in the situation, as we are unable to obtain any stocks for next winter, without which we are faced with inevitable shutdown at that time. It is for this reason that I am asking for your help and assistance.

It is difficult to understand why exportation of thousands of tons of coal should be allowed while public utilities and industrial plants in our own country should be obliged to curtail or shut down because of their inability to secure the necessary fuel to operate their plants.

I trust that you will recognize the urgent necessity of doing everything in your power to relieve this situation.

Yours, very truly,

H. L. OGDEN, Purchasing Agent.

NEW ENGLAND PURCHASING AGENTS ASSOCIATION,  
June 1, 1920.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,  
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This association heartily approves of your recent action in urging the United States Senate to declare an embargo on exports of bituminous coal.

New England is particularly interested in this matter, and immediate action is necessary to forestall an impending industrial paralysis in this section, due to our inability to get proper supplies of coal.

The coal-producing regions are filled with foreign buyers who are bidding against the market for coal for shipments abroad, and the coal-carrying steamers which usually carry coal from tidewater to the New England coast are engaged in carrying coal to foreign ports.

It is impossible at this time to secure sufficient coal to keep New England's industries operating without interruptions, and if these conditions are allowed to continue it is bound to result in much suffering and unemployment in this section during the coming fall and winter.

It is difficult to understand why exportation of thousands of tons of coal should be allowed while public utilities and industrial plants in our own country should be obliged to curtail or



shut down because of their inability to secure the necessary fuel to operate their plants.

Yours, very truly,

J. ARTHUR GIBSON, *President.*

INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO.,  
New York, June 3, 1920.

Subject: Coal situation.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,

*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I note in the public press reference to your anxiety regarding the coal situation. It is fully justified. The difficulty seems to lie mainly or wholly in the lack of transportation facilities.

This company is a large consumer of coal in manufacturing newsprint and other papers, burning about one-half million tons per year. We have already had interruption of our mills notwithstanding contracts for all the coal required. We are now being compelled to buy coal in the open market from retailers, paying as much as \$4 per ton above our contract price. Our position is a desperate one as we furnish paper to more than 400 daily newspapers—large and small.

I venture to suggest that through some agency there should be a very active investigation as to the idle cars and the reason for their remaining idle. It came to my ears a day or two ago, through a channel which I pledged not to disclose, that 5,200 cars, many of them coal cars, were lying idle at Collingwood, Ohio, within a few days. I was told there were thousands of idle cars which had not been moved for weeks.

I assume that the railroad companies in their own interests are active, but the situation seems to suggest that very competent and very active men of experience in such matters should inquire to find these cars and do something toward setting them in motion.

Yours, very truly,

P. T. DODGE.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment:

H. R. 7567. An act for the relief of G. T. and W. B. Hastings, partners trading as Hastings Bros.; and

H. R. 9794. An act for the relief of Wendell Phillips Lodge, No. 365, Knights of Pythias.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4372) to encourage the establishment of farms and suburban homes by veterans of the World War, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 639) thereon.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 203) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to turn over to the county commissioners of Dickinson County, Kans., suitable pontoon equipment for temporary use across the Smoky Hill River at Chapman, Kans., reported it with an amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 676) for the relief of Reuben R. Hunter, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 637) thereon.

Mr. NEW, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4005) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Fore River Shipbuilding Co., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 658) thereon.

#### BRIDGE BILLS.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 13976) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River, at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved February 27, 1919, to be built across the Allegheny River, at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, in the county of Allegheny, and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, are hereby extended two and four years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 13977) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Millvale Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge, authorized by act of Congress approved February 27, 1919, to be built across the Allegheny River, at or near the borough of Millvale, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, are hereby extended two and four years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 13978) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near McKees Rocks Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge, authorized by act of Congress approved February 27, 1919, to be built across the Ohio River at or near McKees Rocks Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, are hereby extended two and four years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4502) creating the District of Columbia insurance fund for the benefit of employees injured and the dependents of employees killed in hazardous employments, providing for the administration of such fund by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NUGENT:

A bill (S. 4503) to amend section 12 of the Federal farm loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NEW (for Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN):

A bill (S. 4504) to authorize an issue of bonds to refund the national war debt; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 4505) for the relief of the heirs of James Taylor, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—OTTO N. BURGE.

On motion of Mr. NEW, it was

*Ordered,* That the papers accompanying the bill (S. 4413), Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, granting an increase of pension to Otto N. Burge be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. KNOX. I desire to give notice of a proposed amendment to the Rules of the Senate, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The reading clerk read as follows:

I desire to give notice that it is my intention to move an amendment to the standing rules of the Senate, to wit, Rule XXV. to the extent and in the manner indicated by the notice:

There shall be appointed at once and hereafter at the commencement of each Congress a committee on revision of the laws, to consist of three Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Pennsylvania when he desires to call up the proposed amendment of the rules?

Mr. KNOX. To-morrow. Under the rule it has to lie over for a day.

#### NAVAL BASE ON SAN FRANCISCO BAY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Acting under and by virtue of a paragraph in the naval appropriation act, creating a joint committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the

House, to investigate the advisability of establishing, developing, and maintaining a naval base on San Francisco Bay or the waters tributary thereto, the Presiding Officer of this body was authorized to appoint five members from the Committee on Naval Affairs. In conformity with the authority thus invested in me, I appoint as members of the joint committee on the part of the Senate the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

#### NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. LODGE. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration. It will take but a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts will be read.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President, to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives, to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses, having completed the business of the present session, are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. LODGE and Mr. UNDERWOOD the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### EFFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14335) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, accept the invitation of the House for a conference, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. UNDERWOOD conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The conference report on House bill 10378, the merchant marine bill, is the unfinished business, and I ask that it may be proceeded with.

The Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President, I desire to record my protest against the acceptance of the conference report on the so-called shipping bill. I opposed the bill when it was considered by the Senate, and my opposition to it is as intense now as it was then.

I do not entertain the most remote doubt that if the bill becomes a law the fleet constructed by the Government at a cost of more than \$3,000,000,000 will be disposed of at a loss of more than a thousand millions of the people's money to private shipping corporations that will parcel out among themselves the trade routes and the markets of the world.

Before entering upon a discussion of the bill I desire to call attention to certain facts in connection with shipping matters generally that may be of interest to Senators.

I quote from a pamphlet entitled "How to Make Seafaring a Permanently Attractive Calling," written by Mr. August Belmont, chairman of the board of trustees, the National Marine League:

The growth of the American merchant marine in ships and men during the last three years has been phenomenal. For a period from 1850 and into the sixties the gross tonnage of the American merchant marine vied with that of Great Britain; but the discrepancy in tonnage in favor of Great Britain, and finally Germany, increased during the next few decades, until in the years preceding the World War the United States was third, and compared with Great Britain, a poor third. Two-thirds of the present seagoing tonnage now under the American flag has been built since 1914, while two-thirds of the tonnage now under foreign flags was built prior to 1914. For the year ending June 30, 1915, the output of American shipyards amounted to only 225,122 gross tons, the smallest production in 17 years; and of this production only 23 were vessels of over 1,000 gross tons, aggregating 127,844 gross tons out of the total production; and on this date the American merchant marine included a total only of 601 ships of 1,000 gross tons or over. For the year ending June 30, 1919, Lloyd's Register reports shipbuilding in progress in the United States as being 994 vessels of 3,894,143 gross tons, against shipbuilding in the British Empire, including all of its dominions, of 991 ships of 2,860,493 gross tons, and the United States

had risen to the second maritime power in the world. Lloyd's Register also shows that the gross tonnage of steam vessels of 100 tons or over of the United Kingdom and British dominions had decreased from 20,524,000 tons in June, 1914, to 18,208,000 tons in June, 1919; whereas the gross tonnage of the United States had increased from 2,027,000 in June, 1914, to 9,773,000 in June, 1919, with a total of 2,058 vessels of over 1,000 gross tons, of which 1,729 were ocean-going steamers, totaling 6,768,422 gross tons. Up to June 30, 1919, the United States Shipping Board had delivered completed 1,056 ships of 5,858,164 dead-weight tons; and after allowing for the suspension and cancellation of contracts for 784 ships, representing 3,823,125 tons, its program of net production called for a balance still to be delivered, in progress and to be contracted for, of 1,312 ships of 7,758,672 dead-weight tons, or an approximate gross tonnage of somewhat in excess of 5,000,000 tons. Thus, without including private enterprise, the operations of the United States Shipping Board (which organization on June 30, 1919, employed 289,594 ship men in shipbuilding yards) would bring the American merchant tonnage, including steel and wooden steamers, in the near future to a figure in excess of 15,000,000 gross tons.

You will observe that, according to Mr. Belmont, the total number of ships constructed, in course of construction, and to be contracted for by the Shipping Board is 2,327, but Judge John Barton Payne, as chairman of the board, testified at the hearing recently held by the Senate Committee on Commerce that the total number of ships so constructed will be 2,311, with a total dead-weight tonnage of 13,592,711. The number of ships as given by Judge Payne is 56 less than that given by Mr. Belmont.

According to a table appearing on page 13 of a pamphlet entitled "For an American Merchant Marine," issued by committee of American shipbuilders, 30 Church Street, New York, the total steam tonnage of 100 tons and upward, owned by the United Kingdom and British dominions, in June, 1914, was 20,524,000; by Germany, 5,135,000; and by the United States, 4,287,000, including both seagoing and Great Lakes.

When we entered the war the German submarine campaign was playing havoc with the world's shipping, and it was perfectly apparent that if the Allies were to win the war it was vitally necessary to put forth every effort not only to curb the submarine menace, but in the construction of ships, otherwise our associates in Europe would be obliged to make peace on Germany's terms because of their utter inability to provide themselves with food and other supplies in quantities sufficient to enable them to continue the prosecution of the war.

Our Government was fully alive to the seriousness of the situation, and embarked upon the most stupendous shipbuilding program ever undertaken by any nation, and it has not as yet been entirely carried out.

Without commenting upon the splendid part played by our ships in bringing the war to a successful conclusion, and without going into details relative to our ship-construction work, I will say that the Government expended about \$170,000,000 in building shipyards, and I repeat that the ships now built, in course of construction, and contracted for represent an expenditure of more than \$3,000,000,000 of the money of the taxpayers of the United States, and the vessels number 2,311 of all types and tonnage.

It is that magnificent fleet that, under the provisions of the shipping bill, will be disposed of to private interests at a loss, in my opinion, of more than one-third of the amount invested in it.

Judge Payne showed at the hearing before the Senate Committee on Commerce that the fleet under the control of the Shipping Board had been operated by the Government from the beginning to the close of the last fiscal year, June 30, 1919, at a profit of \$166,493,161.65, after the payment of insurance in the sum of \$31,149,007.29 and \$29,490,463.77 for repairs.

The fleet is now being operated at a profit to the Government of tens of millions annually.

Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that it is not only desirable but necessary that we have a great merchant fleet in order that the products of our mines, fields, and factories may be transported to every quarter of the globe in American bottoms, and in order that, should the emergency arise, the ships may be used as auxiliaries to our Navy.

When the building program of the Shipping Board is completed we will have such a fleet constructed by the Government, with Government funds, not in the interest of the shipowners, or of any other class of our citizens, but in the interests of the whole people.

As I stated a few moments ago, the fleet is paying a splendid profit to the Government, and I am unalterably opposed to selling it to private corporations at a tremendous loss, as will certainly be done if the pending bill is enacted into law.

Practically the only reason advanced for the passage of the bill is that the Government should not be engaged in business; but, in order to take the Government out of business, we should not make a gift to the Shipping Trust of more than a billion dollars of the people's money. It will not be done with my consent.



It can not truthfully be said that the Government is in competition with private shipowners as the latter at no time in 50 years have had, have now, or, in all probability, will ever have a sufficient number of ships to transport our commerce, and it is a certainty that the Government will never cut rates.

A country-wide propaganda is being prosecuted by those interested in this measure to influence public opinion in its favor. Even in the intermountain country big advertisements in favor of the shipping bill appear in the newspapers. They are signed, "Committee of American Shipbuilders."

By such advertising, that committee is following the same tactics used by the railway executives when the railroad bill was pending and when they were desirous of inducing the people to believe that it was "a thing of beauty and a joy forever," notwithstanding it imposed upon them the payment of a 6 per cent return on the aggregate value of all railroad property in the country.

The same publicity campaign was conducted by the packers, who sought, by paid ads, to create the impression that there is no very considerable profit in their business, because the net return on each dollar of meat sold is but 2 cents. They neglected to say anything about their by-products, and so forth. The report issued a few days ago by the Federal Trade Commission shows that the profits of the packers have trebled and quadrupled during the past three or four years.

Speaking generally, the newspapers have not published anything relative to the facts connected with the pending legislation, and the people are uninformed as to the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, I shall not take up the time of the Senate by analyzing the entire bill, but shall content myself with directing attention to those sections which appear to me to be particularly obnoxious.

The first section declares the purpose of the bill to be, among other things, to dispose of our great merchant fleet to private citizens and the other sections provide for the full accomplishment of that purpose.

Section 5 provides that the board is not only authorized but directed to sell the ships as soon as practicable, consistent with good business methods and the objects and purposes to be attained by the act, to citizens who shall pay the purchase price within 15 years. Also, that in fixing or accepting the sale price the board shall take into consideration the then existing market price, supply of vessels, cost of constructing the particular ship or ships, and so forth, which will cut no more figure, in my opinion, than will injunctions along the same general lines contained in the railroad bill for the ascertainment of the value of railroad property for rate-fixing purposes, which valuation, it now appears, must be fixed at, approximately, the "book value" of the various companies.

The only express limitation on the price at which the board may sell vessels is contained in the first proviso to section 5, which reads as follows:

*Provided*, That no sale shall be made at a less price than the cost at the time of making such sale of constructing vessels of similar types in private yards in the United States, after deducting the depreciation charge against the vessels sold generally allowed in shipping operations.

In other words, the board can not sell vessels for a lower price than similar vessels can be constructed for at the time of sale, and from that construction price must be deducted the allowance for depreciation.

As I stated during the former debate on this bill, it has been charged in Congress and elsewhere, and it is quite generally believed, that American shipbuilders robbed the Government by charging exorbitant prices for building ships during the war and, according to articles recently appearing in the newspapers, the Department of Justice is now endeavoring to recover some of the money of which the Treasury was looted by shipbuilding corporations.

It appears from the pamphlet "For an American Merchant Marine" that it costs nearly twice as much to build a ship in this country as in Great Britain, the cost here being about \$130 per ton, while the cost in a British yard is \$70 per ton.

I venture to predict that if the shipping bill becomes a law practically every vessel in the Government fleet will be sold under the proviso to section 5, which I read a few moments ago, in which event it will be found that vessels of the same types can be constructed in private American yards for at least one-third less than the Government was obliged to pay to the proprietors of those yards for building many of the vessels offered for sale.

In my opinion, the people will be compelled to pocket a loss of one-third, at the least calculation, of the total amount they were required to expend in the construction of the fleet, or \$1,000,000,000.

Even that enormous sum does not represent the total loss, as the amount to be deducted for depreciation on each ship sold, under the proviso mentioned, must be determined.

I do not know what charges are allowed in the shipping business for depreciation, but the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] said, during the course of the debate on the bill, that the Shipping Board is allowing as high as 10 per cent per annum.

A few days since, the Shipping Board leased to the United States Mail Steamship Co. for five years for \$20,655,000, 13 former German passenger ships, and, according to press reports, it was agreed that if at the expiration of the term the lessee so desired it could purchase the ships at the prices and on the terms and conditions to be fixed by the board, and that the amount to be charged off for depreciation of the vessels should be at the rate of 7½ per cent per annum.

Suppose that the Government ships are sold under the proviso mentioned, that they have been in commission for even one year prior to the time of sale, and that the allowance for depreciation is at the rate of 7½ per cent, the loss to the people would be about \$150,000,000, in addition to the billion dollars heretofore stated, to say nothing of the tens of millions of profits now being realized annually because of the operation of the fleet by the Government.

When the pending measure was being considered by the Senate I offered the following amendment, which was agreed to, to section 5:

*Provided further*, That deferred payments of purchase price of vessels under this section shall bear interest at the rate of not less than 5½ per cent per annum, payable semiannually.

It was stricken from the bill by the conferees, and the purchasers of ships will pay such rate of interest on deferred payments as the board shall determine. It may be three or four or five or some other per cent per annum.

Within the past two weeks the Government was obliged to agree to pay interest at the rate of 5½ per cent in order to dispose of \$100,000,000 of certificates of indebtedness. As the Government was compelled to pay that rate on money borrowed to conduct the business of the Nation, it appears to me that those who purchase ships under section 5, and who may have 15 years in which to pay the purchase price, should pay at least the same rate of interest.

I have observed that many of the strongest supporters of the shipping bill were among the most active and enthusiastic advocates of the railroad bill under which the people are required to pay interest at the rate of at least 5½ per cent per annum on the value of all railroad property in the country. I am utterly at a loss to understand what valid objection they can advance to the payment of the same rate of interest by those who purchase Government ships.

Section 7 of the bill, in substance and effect, authorizes and directs the Shipping Board to establish and operate at Government expense steamship lines in any quarter of the globe it may deem advisable and necessary, and that in the event a profitable trade is built up, and private interests desire to take it over, the people shall pocket the losses sustained in developing such trade, which may amount to millions, sell the ships under section 5, and retire from that particular field.

Section 7 also provides for payment by the Government for the carrying of the mails, which is, in effect, a subsidy.

Section 11 provides that the Shipping Board shall annually for five years set aside \$50,000,000 to be used in the construction of and in aid of the construction of ships in private shipyards in the United States, which undoubtedly is one of the reasons for the great activity displayed by the shipbuilders in support of this measure. They are, quite naturally, exceedingly desirous of transferring \$250,000,000 from the Public Treasury to their own.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, would it trouble the Senator if I should interrupt him for a moment in order to ask for a little explanation?

Mr. NUGENT. Not at all.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does the Senator mean that it is proposed that we shall abandon our own shipyards and pay to have this work done in private shipyards?

Mr. NUGENT. Precisely.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Why can we not use our own shipyards, for which we have spent so much?

Mr. NUGENT. Echo answers, why?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is there not any explanation for that proposal?

Mr. NUGENT. The only explanation, I will say to the Senator, that I have heard is the desire to take the Government out of business; in other words, that the Government should not be

engaged either in the shipping business or in the shipbuilding business.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But, Mr. President, we have already gotten into it; and ought we not to use what we have and what we have spent the public money for?

Mr. NUGENT. That is my contention, I will say to the Senator, and I have made that contention at all times.

That section—11—further provides that vessels constructed for the Government with Government funds and, when built, to be operated by the Government shall be constructed in private yards. There is not, in my judgment, even a semblance of justification for that provision in view of the fact that the Government has expended about \$170,000,000 in building shipyards, and it will be conceded that they are as complete in every respect as money can make them. The only excuse that can be offered for the provision referred to is the desire to divorce the Government from business. In fact, that is, as I have said, the principal reason advanced in support of this legislation, and yet the section under discussion places the Government in the money-lending business. It provides that when a citizen desires to build a ship he may borrow from the Government a sum not exceeding two-thirds of the cost of constructing the vessel. Many of the proponents of the bill voted in favor of a loan of hundreds of millions of the people's money to the railroads for 15 years. "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. NUGENT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does the Senator mean that the Government, with a large number of vessels on hand and already built, is to use the people's money to build now in private yards additional ships to compete with those we have already built, and possibly to interfere with the proper sale of those ships in the future?

Mr. NUGENT. That is precisely what the section to which I have referred provides.

Sections 22 and 23 provide, in effect, that the Government shall establish steamship lines from the United States to Alaska and in the Philippine Islands and operate them at Government expense so long as such operation is carried on at a loss, and that when such lines become profitable the Government shall retire in favor of private interests and the people shall assume all losses incurred.

The first paragraph of section 25 provides that the owner of a vessel documented under the laws of the United States and operated in foreign trade shall, each year, for the period of 10 years, be exempt from the payment of excess and war profits taxes on the net earnings of the vessel, provided he annually invests in or sets aside in a trust fund for investment in the construction of ships in the United States a sum equal to the amount of such excess and war profits taxes.

I know of no good reason why the men engaged in coastwise shipping should be discriminated against, as it appears to me that they are entitled to the same consideration at the hands of Congress as are citizens engaged in foreign trade. Neither do I know of any valid reason why shipowners should be exempted from the payment of taxes which men engaged in all other lines of business must pay.

The second paragraph of section 25 provides that during the period of 10 years from the enactment of the act a citizen who sells a vessel documented under the laws of the United States shall be excused from the payment of all income taxes on the proceeds of the sale, provided such proceeds are invested in the construction of new ships in American shipyards, and so forth.

I am opposed to exempting a shipowner from the operation of the tax laws that men engaged in other pursuits are obliged to comply with, merely because he invests the money received from the sale of one ship in the building of another ship.

The farmer who sells one farm and expends the proceeds of the sale in the development of another farm, it may be from raw sagebrush land; the sheepman or cattleman who disposes of his flock or herd and later purchases another, frequently at a price per head in excess of what he sold for; the merchant who sells his store in one town and establishes himself in the mercantile business in a new town; and the miner who sells a mine and expends the sum paid him in opening up another mine, in which work he may lose his last dollar, are obliged to pay the taxes imposed by law. I am utterly opposed to granting to shipowners a tax-exemption privilege not enjoyed by other American citizens.

There are other provisions of the measure to which I object, but I shall not take the time to discuss them.

Last night the Senate voted to displace the minimum-wage bill, which means its defeat. It provides for the payment to the employees of the Government of a wage of at least \$1,080

per annum. To those who believe that such wage is too high to be paid to men and women who work for their daily bread I again say what I believe to be the fact, that the enactment of the shipping bill means a gift to shipping interests of more than a thousand millions of the taxpayers' money.

Believing as I do that the bill is inimical to the best interests of the people, I shall vote against the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I desire to make a few remarks. I heartily share the sentiment of the committee favorable to the maintenance of a great American merchant marine. I believe prior to the war that this was one of the crying needs of the Nation, and it was one of the misfortunes of our country that the merchant marine which we formerly had in the early days had from time to time passed into the hands of foreigners, and that on account of that fact there were very few vessels sailing under the Stars and Stripes and operating under American control.

As one of the fortunes of war our Nation acquired a very large fleet. This fleet, in my opinion, should be permanently maintained and the Nation should have such advantages as will accrue to it as the result of the maintenance of an efficient American merchant marine.

I believe, Mr. President, that in the anxiety of the committee and, possibly, of a majority of the Members of the Senate to transfer the ownership of these vessels to private owners and to discontinue Government operation we may possibly be a little too zealous in our advocacy and support of this policy.

We should guard well our decision or we may probably make a mistake which will result in the disintegration of the American merchant marine. The bill, as explained by the Senator from Idaho, shows plainly that the tendency running throughout the pending measure is to encourage the sale of the Government-owned ships. During the war the cry was "Ships, and more ships," and this was held out as one of the Nation's greatest needs if we were to achieve victory; but the intention of Congress, as voiced in the measure under consideration, seems to be to sell the ships, to sell the ships.

What I am particularly interested in is the question of the development of new trade routes, the matter of our country owning and controlling its own merchant marine. One of the safest and most secure ways in which to foster and preserve this policy to our Government and to retain this industry for the American people is unquestionably not to magnify the idea of disposing of the ships and placing them in the hands of individuals or of private corporations. I believe that instead of the announced policy of the Congress being to sell the ships, to get them into the hands of private ship-operating corporations, it should be primarily and first that we will have an American merchant marine second to that of no nation of the world, and that we will pursue a policy that will be in the interest of the establishment and development and maintenance of new trade routes and the increasing of our foreign commerce.

I can not quite understand why the Government, in its anxiety to maintain the merchant marine and in its desire to establish new trade routes, should undergo the initial cost, the losses, if any, and the expense of building up this trade, and of the maintenance of the fleet until it reaches a profitable basis, then transferring it to some private corporation that it may operate the business so developed for its own private gain; but that seems to be the declared policy and the idea which is embraced in this measure throughout.

I am just a little apprehensive, Mr. President, that if you allow the American fleet to pass into the hands of ship-operating corporations the policy which should be primary—that is, the maintaining of an American merchant marine, the policy of establishing and maintaining the necessary trade routes—will become secondary, and that these corporations in the operation of these ships will have as their primary purpose, as is always true, the object first of making money for the corporations themselves. If this should be the plan adopted by the corporations operating the ships—and no doubt it would be—I assert that in all probability some trade routes that have already been established would be abandoned for some other trade routes, regardless of the interests of the American people and regardless of a policy that should be maintained to try to relieve the transportation congestion which exists in certain centers within this country.

A system has developed centralizing very largely the shipping from the North Atlantic ports of our country. This tendency toward the centering of the shipping from the North Atlantic ports was emphasized during last year when it came to the



question of the Shipping Board allocating its vessels. I happen to have more or less intimate knowledge in connection with at least some of these transactions. When it became known, following soon after the conclusion of the war, that the board contemplated allocating these vessels to private concerns for operation there was a great clamor for them from interests that desired to operate them practically exclusively from the North Atlantic ports, and in the struggle of certain representatives from the South Atlantic and the Gulf ports to have vessels allocated that would operate out of those ports and take up the matter of inaugurating and establishing trade with the South American countries, we had to combat that selfish interest which desired to have, you may say, a monopoly upon these vessels for the purpose of operating them from New York and other North Atlantic ports—ports that already have more business than they can handle expeditiously.

In its wisdom and actuated by a spirit of fairness, however, the Shipping Board did provide for the use of certain ships from the South Atlantic and the Gulf ports. The board did approve of the idea of the establishment of certain trade routes from those southern ports to the countries to the south. The wisdom of the judgment of the board has been shown, in that most of these new trade routes have already demonstrated the fact that they are serving a good purpose, and the ships engaged are being operated at a profit.

We should not be interested first in trying to get the ships transferred to private corporations in order that they may operate them. We should be far more concerned in the primary purpose of the maintenance of an American merchant marine; and if that necessitates and requires the Government retaining control and ownership of these vessels, or a large majority of them, for a reasonable time, it should be done. We, too, are intensely interested in the development of the trade routes to the south, and they should be developed and operated in connection with the South Atlantic and the Gulf ports and not the North Atlantic ports. If there is one evil in this country from which the American people should be relieved, it is the bottling up of the freight from all over the country in the city of New York. There is scarcely a section of the country but that has suffered on account of the congestion which almost continuously exists, bottling up everything in this particular center. However, as far as private corporations and private interests are concerned, as a rule they do not look with favor upon trying to serve the various sections of the country, trying to relieve this condition which brings about disastrous results to various sections of the Nation, but they are actuated absolutely by the sole purpose of making money, and making money for themselves.

On account of my fear that the fleet will not be maintained in its entirety as an American merchant marine under the provisions of this bill, on account of my apprehension that new trade routes probably will be abandoned when the ships get into the hands of private owners, and that we will not develop certain trade which should be developed, I can not give my support to the conference report. I opposed the measure when it was before the Senate, and there have been no changes made which to me make it a bill more favorably looking to what I consider should be the main purposes and objects to be sought in dealing with the fleet at the present time in the hands of the United States Shipping Board.

The members of the Shipping Board, as far as I know them, are all very high-toned, honorable, capable business men; but it is the expressed policy of this measure to sell ships. While emphasis is placed upon maintaining an American merchant marine, an equal if not greater emphasis is placed upon the desire to sell the ships. This sentiment is in harmony with the sentiment which prevails among the membership of the Shipping Board; and if you pass this legislation, with it being evidently the determined purpose of the Shipping Board to dispose of the vessels and place them in the hands of private corporations, and then it also being the expressed and specifically declared purpose of Congress that they shall pass into private ownership, and that as expeditiously as possible, we may well realize that it will be only a short time until practically all of the vessels of any value now owned by the Government will be in the hands of private corporations and operated in that way.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Do I understand the Senator's position to be that the Federal Government should retain the title to these ships of which the Senator has been speaking and continue to operate them as a private individual would operate the ships, the same as it operated the railroads during the period

of the war and after the war, with the distinction that in the latter case it did not have the title to the roads or the cars? In other words, is it the Senator's policy for the Federal Government to go into the shipping transportation business? And if that is his view, I am interested in knowing where the Senator finds authority in the Constitution of the United States for the Federal Government to become a carrier of passengers and a carrier of freight. If it may engage in the marine transportation business, may it not engage in land transportation? And if it engages in land transportation, may it not construct roads and highways, build railroads, operate them; and in order to make the roads profitable, may it not be compelled to own mines in order to find products to ship, build factories in order to find products to ship on its roads, engage in the agricultural business and the stock-raising business in order to produce those commodities which would pay for the operation of its roads? In other words, does not such a policy foreshadowed by the Senator, if I understand the matter correctly, mean that the Federal Government is to be one huge Prussian socialism—all power in the State, all power centered in Washington, all power here in officials and bureaucracies, which dominate and control and lay their paralyzing hand upon the activities and upon the industries of the United States?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, answering the Senator from Utah, I will state that I did not take the position that the Government should permanently operate the ships, but I do take the position that the Government should make its primary purpose that of establishing these trade routes, and that of the maintenance of an American merchant marine, and if that can be best and most safely secured by the Government retaining the property which it already owns, by the Government retaining the business upon which it has already embarked, which it has developed, then I say, Mr. President, that the Government should retain these ships, and should continue to operate this business until it is beyond all question to the advantage of the American people that they should be placed in the hands of private owners. About \$3,000,000,000 of the money of the people of the Nation has been invested in the Government fleet, and it should not be sacrificed now to private greed.

I do not think there is any analogy between the railroad question and that of the shipping proposition. The railroads had been developed, they had been built up, they had been maintained by private capital entirely, and the Government merely took them over during the emergency. The Government did not own them, and in a large measure, Mr. President, it was a matter of the Government coming to the rescue when the railroad interests of this country were crying for help. That had a great deal to do with stimulating and actuating the Government in taking over the railroads.

We have altogether a different situation as far as the question of dealing with these ships. I think that hindsight is always better than foresight, and if we are to consider the lessons of the past, as far as the building up a merchant marine in the hands of private corporations is concerned, we know what the policy of this Nation has been.

We know that as far as maintaining an American merchant marine heretofore through private capital and private ownership, it has proven an utter and a colossal failure. We know that instead of the general good, general welfare, of the American people being considered, selfish interests have been the controlling factors with those who have attempted to operate the shipping interest, and as a result the American flag had almost disappeared from the seas long before the Nation became involved in the recent war.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator appreciate the fact that prior to the Civil War the United States had a splendid merchant marine and that we carried in our own bottoms from 87 to 93 per cent of all of our foreign trade and commerce, but that because of the unjust, discriminatory, oppressive, and unwise legislation enacted by the dominant political party of the land the merchant marine was driven from the seas? Does not the Senator believe that with a wise and proper policy we can not only develop but continue an adequate merchant marine, one which will be sufficient for the needs of the country?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, of course if we deal in glittering generalities I would necessarily reply in the affirmative; but the question is as to the details and the policies which are being adopted for the purpose of carrying out that very commendable purpose and object, and I do not think that when you adopt a policy which indicates as one of the very first

objects, the primary purpose, that of selling the ships, you are making quite as secure as I would like to see made the future of the American merchant marine and the establishment and the development of foreign trade and the assurance of new trade routes and their maintenance.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator pardon me?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The Senator stated that the merchant marine in the hands of private parties has been a colossal failure. I merely invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that we did have in private hands one of the finest merchant marines that floated a flag upon the sea, and that if it had not been for unwise legislation on the part of Congress, following, in my humble opinion, an improper and impracticable economic policy, we would have had at the beginning of the war, and would still have, an adequate merchant marine.

If the Senator will pardon me, in my judgment you can build up a merchant marine by fair and just and sensible legislation, and if the Government attempts to engage in the carrying business it will lose hundreds of millions of dollars every year; and I make the prediction now to the Senator—of course it is a mere prediction, which may not be verified—that if the Government should retain these ships and attempt to operate them, the three billion and more dollars which we have put into the ships would be dissipated within 10 years. The losses would be hundreds of millions annually, instead of an alleged profit, as represented by some of the reports which have been submitted to us.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I agree with quite a good deal stated by the Senator from Utah, but what I am disturbed about is that if we lean too much toward the idea of placing these vessels in the hands of private ownership, we will have some more unwise legislation, we will have a further continuation of a policy which will not be in the interest of the maintenance of the merchant marine, and possibly as the outcome once again, to our regret and dismay, we will see Great Britain and other powers gradually, by direct or indirect methods, acquire over us an advantage and control of the world's shipping on the seas.

The Senator from Utah talks about the question of dissipating the billions of dollars in this transportation equipment and facilities. It seems that we may also consider the question of the millions upon millions which are to be dissipated and expended in developing trade routes and developing business for the purpose of turning it over to private interests when it once reaches a profitable basis. I can not quite discriminate between a policy which in its operation brings about the promotion of a business for the purpose of turning it over to some private interests after it becomes profitable and a policy of the Government, even when necessary, to continue that same operation in the interest of all the American people, instead of in the interest of the few who will be the recipients of the benefaction of the Government in developing a profitable business and turning it over to them.

Senators talk about the Government engaging in business. As a result of this war the Government has, you might say, become the benefactor of the railroad interests and many other interests in this country. The railroads were not quite satisfied with having \$300,000,000 loaned to them for only five years; they knock at the door of Congress and say, "We would like to have the loan extended to 15 years." So the Congress, regardless of the expressed reluctance of some to carrying on a banking business by the Government to assist the railroads, responds promptly to the appeal of the railroad interests of the country and passes a measure authorizing these loans to be made for 15 years.

This very measure itself places the Government in the money-lending business. This very measure itself places the Government in the insurance business by providing for an insurance fund.

I think if we are going to be consistent along the line of the Government being so very zealous in shunning even the appearance of evil in the matter of the Government engaging in business of this character, we had better start anew and abandon the action of Congress in regard to many other enterprises.

What I am apprehensive of is that the vessels will pass out of the hands of the Government into private ownership, and that they will pass into the hands of private ownership probably at a great sacrifice. Then when they are transferred from ownership by the Government into ownership of private capital, private capital will continue to be knocking at the doors of Congress for legislation that will promote its own financial interests, and the primary object of an American merchant marine, the primary object of the establishment and maintenance of new trade routes, and the object of relieving conges-

tion in the North Atlantic and dividing the trade with ports to which it logically belongs, will probably, in a large measure at least, be abandoned. For this reason I do not feel that I can consistently support the conference report.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall occupy the time of the Senate for only a moment. I voted against the bill when it was before the Senate, and I shall vote against the adoption of the conference report.

I am not satisfied with this measure, not for the reasons, however, assigned by my distinguished friends, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL]. Lack of time prevents an analysis of the bill, and I content myself with a few generalizations. One objection to the bill arises because it seeks to perpetuate a socialistic policy in connection with the ownership and operation of the ships in this country. I believe that the economic policy founded upon a proper understanding has led to the prosperity and development of our country. Our industrial and economic system was influenced by the great teachings of Adam Smith and his philosophy and the philosophy of the great teachers following him. It became the basis of the economic system which has produced such marvelous development in this country. We have had a competitive system, freedom of opportunity, and an even show in the race of life. We have political freedom. There must be economic and industrial liberty.

There have been forces which have sought to destroy competition and to establish monopolies. Such forces must be overcome, and every man within the land must have an equal opportunity in the activities of life.

I am opposed to all forms of paternalism and the corroding socialism of the age that has laid its destructive hand upon the Government and is seeking its domination and the perversion of its functions and the destruction of the foundation upon which it rests. Extreme Carl Marxian socialism will not, in my opinion, prevail in this Republic. I believe the good sense of the American people will revolt against his heresies and the destructive and damning doctrines which are sapping the life and vigor of Russia. But there is a subtle, an alluring, and enticing form of socialism that is receiving support in many sections of our country and has sometimes met sympathetic support from officials in high places in the Government.

There is a movement on foot to compel the Government to repossess the railroads for the purpose of transferring them to those who may be employed upon the railroads. And there are those who seek to compel the Government to retain the ownership and to continue the operation of the merchant marine and all the ships which the Government has acquired. I believe the best interests of the people as well as the Government will be subserved by a sale, under proper restrictions and limitations, of the ships owned by the Government.

Mr. President, the Government can no more operate economically and efficiently ships and railroads than it can operate its own business. There is not a business man in the United States of any acumen who could not take possession of the governmental agencies and instrumentalities functioning in Washington and elsewhere and conduct the Government business in a more efficient manner than it is being conducted by the Government of the United States at a cost of 33 per cent of that now paid by the United States.

The Senator from Florida states that we should open up trade routes. Why, of course that should be done, and we can do so by imposing limitations upon the sale of the ships. The men who buy the ships should be required to open up certain trade routes to be designated by the board and for the purpose of extending our foreign trade, and in the sale of ships there should be imposed such limitations as will preserve the interests of the shippers and the interests of the people of the United States. If I believed that the interests of the American people would be served by a Government-owned merchant marine, much as I dislike socialism and the paternalism which it would involve, I might be induced to support the proposition; but everyone who knows what this socialistic policy means and what its consequences will be and the inefficiency of governmental control and governmental ownership and operation of matters that are purely private will reach the conclusion that a policy which perpetuates the Federal Government in the transportation business is one inimical to the interests of the people and hostile to the best interests of the Republic.

The Senator from Florida refers to the railroads. Mr. President, I was opposed to taking over the railroads. I think it was a great misfortune. If there had been a modification of the Sherman antitrust law in some of its provisions for the period of the war, permitting them to pool and use joint terminals and work along some of the lines of cooperation and coordination employed by the Government, there would have been no



necessity—if there was any necessity at all—of the Government taking by its strong hand the railroads out of the control of their owners. But this relief was refused by the Government, and it also monopolized the credit of the country. It took the money of the country in loans, importuning the people, appealing to their patriotism, to buy Government bonds, to loan their money to the Government. The banks were almost dragged to yield up their resources to the Government, and those who possessed savings were appealed to to loan the same to the United States. Railroads, school districts, municipalities that desired to build, legitimate enterprises being carried on by individuals and corporations which required money, could not obtain the same, because the Government exclusively occupied the field of credit and absorbed not hundreds of millions but billions of dollars. The man who had a thousand or a hundred thousand dollars to loan invested it in Government bonds, loaned it to his Government rather than to private enterprise.

As a result the fountain of many enterprises was dried up; we denied the opportunity to railroads and to individuals, to municipalities and to States, to borrow money. Why, sirs, many of them were compelled to come to the boards of control in Washington and plead for permission to issue bonds or stock, hoping thereby to borrow money absolutely necessary to save their business from ruin. And school districts with half-completed schoolhouses came here and sought authority to float bonds in order to complete their buildings, in order that the children might not be turned into the streets. The Government acted as a sponge and sucked up the credit of the land and the money that was in circulation.

We can not with becoming grace condemn the railroads and other enterprises because they did not make fitting progress during the war and did not accomplish the work which they were desirous of performing.

I am opposed to the conference report. I am opposed to the bill. It is not a bill, as the Senator from Florida indicates, if I may be permitted to dissent from him, which accomplishes what he asserts will be accomplished. It is a bill which ought to gratify him. It is a bill which will keep the Government for many years to come in the transportation business, and the Senator from Florida, young and vigorous as he is, will not live long enough to see the omnipotent hand of the Federal Government removed from the merchant marine of this country. That is one of the reasons why I am opposing the bill and the conference report.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, if I could have my way I would have the Government hold temporarily both the railroads and the ships until internal conditions and world conditions became more settled and until better opportunity existed for reaching a satisfactory solution. I would have a competent commission investigate the entire subject and report as to the best thing to be done under the circumstances. All systems of transportation—ocean, inland waterway, railway, and highway—are parts of one great problem.

The trouble is that in our haste to dispossess ourselves both of the railroads and the ships we may make inevitable Government ownership without having given the subject proper consideration, or Government interference on an almost intolerable scale. Inasmuch as the Congress seems determined upon the immediate resumption of the policy of private ownership, I shall offer no further opposition to the conference report, but shall content myself by voting against it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, on the adoption of the conference report I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and vote "yea."

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea," and I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. DIAL (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] is unavoidably detained to-day and is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). As announced by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL], I am paired with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr.

SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I inquire if the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. That Senator is not present. In his absence I can not vote and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GAY. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and vote "yea."

Mr. SPENCER. I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], but under an arrangement with him I feel free to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and I do not observe him in his seat. I therefore transfer that pair to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. GLASS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], which I transfer to the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]; and

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 14, as follows:

#### YEAS—45.

Beckham	Hale	Nelson	Sterling
Brandegge	Harding	New	Sutherland
Caldor	Henderson	Overman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Page	Thomas
Cornor	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Townsend
Curtis	Kendrick	Pittman	Underwood
Dial	Keyes	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Knox	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Lodge	Simmons	Warren
Gay	McCumber	Smith, Md.	
Gerry	McKellar	Smoot	
Glass	McNary	Spencer	

#### NAYS—14.

Ashurst	Harris	Norris	Trammell
Borah	Harrison	Nugent	Walsh, Mass.
Capper	Kenyon	Reed	
Culberson	King	Sheppard	

#### NOT VOTING—37.

Ball	Gronna	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newberry	Smith, S. C.
Edge	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Stanley
Elkins	Kellogg	Penrose	Watson
Fall	Kirby	Phipps	Williams
Fletcher	La Follette	Poinexter	Wolcott
France	Lenroot	Robinson	
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Sherman	
Gore	McLean	Shields	

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I took no time in discussing the questions involved in this bill on the adoption of the conference report, which has just been agreed to, because I desire to get it over to the other House as soon as possible, and all these matters were discussed when the bill was before the Senate. I am going to take only a moment or two now. Some people, however, on the outside have raised the question as to the meaning of the words "controlling interest," which are found in the section relating to the ownership of stock in shipping corporations. The term is used just the same as it is used in the present shipping act, and I do not think there can be any question about the construction that should be given to it. I know that the committee understood it to mean actual bona fide American ownership of a majority of the stock of corporations doing business in the foreign trade and 75 per

cent in the coastwise trade. I am satisfied that that is the understanding that the Senate has with reference to that language and that provision. The language of the section will not permit a "dummy" corporation or a "dummy" holding of stock. The corporation must be a bona fide one and the ownership and holding of stock must be bona fide American.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], as well as the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE], was very greatly disappointed because the conferees left out of the bill one provision which had been inserted in it when it was passed by the Senate. I refer to the provision reimbursing the city of Hoboken for taxes of which it had been deprived by reason of the Government taking over certain docks. The conferees were all very sympathetic toward that item. We thought it was a very just proposition, but if adopted it would establish a precedent that would apply to a great many different sections of the country and involve the Government in great expense. This does not affect the justice of the Government taking care of such a situation, but we thought that should be cared for in a separate bill dealing with all similar cases. So the conferees thought that they could not leave it in this bill, but that it would have to be dealt with in a separate measure. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has introduced such a bill, to which I know the committees of the two Houses will give the most careful consideration. I will do my best to aid him in securing proper action. These Senators have certainly left nothing undone that could be done in this matter, but we could not take care of that in this bill.

The senior Senator from New Jersey left with me a letter from a gentleman in New Jersey, and his answer to it, in reference to the matter, which he asked me to have inserted in the RECORD. I therefore ask that the correspondence be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The correspondence referred to is as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY,  
Chambers, May 17, 1920.

Hon. J. S. FRELINGHUYSEN.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In the effort "to make democracy safe for the world" this city has been driven to the verge of bankruptcy by the Government taking over our valuable pier property without compensation. This property constituted the most valuable asset we have, and yet we have been deprived of it for the benefit of the Nation at large without one dollar contribution to our people.

We are willing to suffer our share of the common misfortune, but we should not be asked to turn our property over to the Nation without recompense. No other section of the Nation that I know of has been subjected to such a sacrifice, and we should not (a small city 1 mile square, depending upon its taxable territorial area for its income) be asked to submit to it in common justice.

I am writing you as an old friend and brother Senator to interest yourself in our behalf, so that with your assistance and that of Senator EDGE this injustice may be speedily righted. Let me know when you come to town. I would like to show you through Hoboken. It won't take long, but there is much to be seen.

With best wishes, I am,  
Very truly, yours,

JAMES F. MINTURN.  
MAY 26, 1920.

Hon. JAMES F. MINTURN,  
Hoboken, N. J.

MY DEAR JUSTICE MINTURN: I have never forgotten the injustice done to the city of Hoboken in the taking over of the property by the Government and the failure to provide for the relief of Hoboken by reason of the loss of taxes.

I inclose herewith my correspondence to the President and call attention to my protest and my effort to have an amendment put in the Alien Property Custodian act.

However, we have recently secured, in the merchant marine shipping bill, a provision which will enable the Shipping Board to pay the city of Hoboken the necessary taxes to reimburse them for last year and this year.

If this bill is accepted by the House, as I hope it will be, it will relieve the situation immediately.

Please return the correspondence inclosed for my files.  
Very sincerely, yours,

JOS. S. FRELINGHUYSEN,  
United States Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Now, Mr. President, just a word further. I deem it just to say that the conferees from both sides of the Chamber and from both branches of Congress have worked

upon this bill with the sole purpose of reporting to the Senate a bill that would build up the American merchant marine. The entire consideration of the bill has been wholly free from partisanship. There was no attempt on the part of the House Members to see how many Senate amendments they could get us to recede from, but every provision of the Senate bill as passed, which they thought was a good provision, they accepted gladly. This bill is the product of the united effort of Democratic and Republican Members of the House and Senate. It is not a perfect bill, but it is a bill which we believe will be the basis upon which we will build up and maintain a great American merchant marine. This bill will serve most, if not all, the great purposes that have been expressed by Senators who have spoken to-day; and I believe, Mr. President, that in the years to come the Greene bill, as it is and should be known, will prove its wisdom in the building up of a permanent American merchant marine worthy of our great power, wealth, and position in world affairs, and be a lasting monument to the unselfish and patriotic work of all those who aided in its preparation and passage.

Mr. President, there have been some errors made in the numbering of the sections. I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside for a moment in order that there may be considered and passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the clerks to make the necessary changes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution which I send to the desk.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes, the Clerk be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to number the sections thereof in consecutive order.*

#### PROPOSED SOLDIERS' BONUS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter in reference to the bonus bill from a real soldier, who served with the Forty-second Division in France. I think it should appear in the RECORD, and I ask that it may be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator to have it read from the desk.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well; I will ask that the letter be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

CHATHAM COURTS,  
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1920.

SIR: I herewith urge you, as an officer of the United States Senate, to use your influence against the passage in that House of the World War adjusted compensation act.

The veterans who would receive a bonus as the result of this act do not wish to be so insulted, and both Congress and the people at large have already extended to the veterans of the World War their appreciation of the military service rendered. Defeat the soldiers' bonus bill.

Respectfully, yours,

J. BENTLEY MULFORD,  
Honorably Discharged Private,  
Forty-second (Rainbow) Division,  
American Expeditionary Forces.

Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,  
Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter which I have received but a short time ago from the representatives of one of the American Legion Posts. The letter has to do with the proposal for a bonus.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator ask the Secretary to read the letter, just as he read the letter which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] presented?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I present the letter. Permit me to say that I do so without prejudice as to the issue involved.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

THE CAPITOL,  
Washington, D. C., June 4, 1920.

Senator WADSWORTH,  
New York.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, were delegated by the Federal Board Students Post, No. 750, American Legion, of New York University, to come to Washington to exert our efforts in behalf of the Darrow bill. We have been in the gallery for some time and have listened to the Senator who read into the RECORD a letter "from a real soldier" in opposition to the bonus bill.



We desire to state that our post is composed of "real soldiers," every one of its 300 members disabled and the majority wounded. Many divisions are represented in our membership, among others the Forty-second, in which the Senator's "real soldier" served.

This post has twice gone on record unanimously in favor of the adjusted compensation bill not only for disabled men but for all ex-service men.

You are requested to read this into the RECORD in order to give these 300 "real soldiers" a chance to record their sentiments.

Yours, very truly,

E. B. HACKER,  
President Post 750,  
3141 Kingsbridge Terrace, New York City.  
T. E. McDONNELL,  
Past President Post 750,  
109 Flushing Avenue, Jamaica, Long Island.

#### FORCE AND SALARIES IN PATENT OFFICE.

During the delivery of the speech of Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I recognize that Senators can not be prevented from talking, and I have no objection to their doing so, but, in order that we may proceed in parliamentary order, I ask that the bill which under the unanimous-consent agreement is in order may now be laid before the Senate, and the Senator from Washington can speak on that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no objection to that being done.

Mr. NORRIS. Under the unanimous-consent agreement we were to consider House bill 11984 at the conclusion of the consideration of the conference report on the merchant marine bill, and I ask that the House bill referred to be now laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays the bill before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11984) to increase the force and salaries in the Patent Office, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Patents with amendments.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before that request is granted, does the Senator ask to have the reading of the bill dispensed with entirely?

Mr. NORRIS. No; merely that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read first for committee amendments.

#### AMENDMENT OF TRADING-WITH-THE-ENEMY ACT.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that the business of the Senate may be temporarily laid aside while I make a report from the Judiciary Committee and ask for its present consideration; and in connection with it I will make a brief statement, not occupying over five minutes.

Mr. NORRIS. I assume that it will not lead to any extended debate. With that understanding, I have no objection.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. From the Committee on the Judiciary the Senator from Minnesota reports back favorably the bill (H. R. 14208) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this bill is unanimously reported by the Judiciary Committee, and I desire to make a brief statement in relation to it.

As Senators know, under the trading-with-the-enemy act the Alien Property Custodian took possession of millions of dollars worth of the property of aliens and allies of aliens. Since the war closed, and since the treaty of peace has been drawn up and has been ratified by all the belligerents except the United States and China, it has left conditions in this way: There are certain of these people who have transferred their allegiance under the treaty of peace who ought to be protected. The object of the bill is to give the people who belong to these new States, like Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Alsace-Lorraine, an opportunity to come before the President and obtain the release of their property that was seized by the Alien Property Custodian. Some of that property was converted into money, and some of it remains in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian in kind.

The bill provides that these people can recover their property—the Poles and the Czecho-Slovaks and the Alsaticans and the Lorrainers. In addition to that, it covers some other cases. It covers the cases, first, of American women who before the war lost their citizenship by marrying neutrals. That is one class. Then it covers the cases of native-born American women who married Germans or Austrians, enemy aliens. It is to give

those two classes of woman an opportunity to recover their property. Then it relates to another class of men, not very numerous. The Alien Property Custodian seized the property of consular representatives and diplomats, and it is to enable them to get back their property.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to ask the Senator if the bill includes the class of American citizens who, unfortunately, were in the enemy's country at the time the war broke out, and whose property was taken, and they have been unable to return to the United States because of the state of war and the restrictions that were imposed, and their property is still held by the Alien Property Custodian?

Mr. NELSON. Yes; it includes them. I was about to remark that it also includes another class. Senators will remember that during the war quite a number of people were interned because of their officious activity in behalf of the Germans. Most of them, I think nearly all of them, have been discharged, and a large share of them have returned to their own country. This bill contains a provision that those interned men who have been discharged and who are living here at the time they make application for the return of their property and at the time the application is granted shall be in the same status as the other classes.

Those are the substantial provisions of the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President—

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no doubt the Senator has made the statement clearly, but I did not entirely grasp it, in reference to the German alien who was living in this country at the time of the declaration of war, and remained in this country during the war, but was interned by the order of the President, and his property was taken. This bill authorizes that man's property to be returned to him, does it?

Mr. NELSON. If he is living in this country, it does; but not if he leaves this country. It applies only to those who continue to live here, and are living here at the time of the application.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I desire to ask the Senator with reference to another class that he has mentioned. If I understand him rightly, while the German could not claim his property rights, the wife of the German, who is a German citizen, could claim such rights provided she at one time before her marriage was an American citizen.

Mr. NELSON. Yes. If she is a native-born American woman, and lost her citizenship either by marrying a neutral before the war or by marrying an alien enemy, such as a German, before the war, she is authorized to regain her property, not the property of her husband.

Mr. McCUMBER. It places it in a position where the alien, if he is a male, can not obtain his property; but if the alien is the wife of a foreigner she may obtain it, provided she was born in this country?

Mr. NELSON. The object is to give American women who have married these foreigners an opportunity to get back the property that they formerly had; that is, their own exclusively.

Mr. McCUMBER. I confess that I can not see any difference between granting them their property and granting their husbands their property.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. I have in mind a case which came to my attention, and I desire to know whether this bill covers it. An American woman married a German officer. They are both dead, but they left an heir. The property would go to that child. It was all originally the property of the American woman. Is the child protected under this bill?

Mr. NELSON. I do not think it is, in express terms. Is the child living in this country?

Mr. PITTMAN. The child, I think, is living in this country.

Mr. NELSON. Was it born in this country?

Mr. PITTMAN. I think not. I think it was born in a foreign country.

Mr. NELSON. Then I do not think this law would cover it. It only covers the cases of those native-born American women who married foreigners, either neutrals or alien enemies, before the war.

Mr. PITTMAN. Does not the Senator think the bill should extend to the heirs of the woman who would be entitled to a remedy under this bill?

Mr. NELSON. If the child's mother is of that class, I think the child would come in under it. I did not understand the

Senator's statement at first. If his mother belonged to that class, and this is property inherited from his mother, I think it would be construed that he would have a right to come in under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to understand whether this bill provides that any citizen of Alsace-Lorraine or any citizen of any subject people of Germany or Austria-Hungary which under the terms of the treaty has been taken away from Germany or Austria-Hungary is by that act and under the terms of this bill removed from the class of an alien enemy?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly. That is one of the main purposes of the bill—to allow the Alsations and the Lorrainers and the citizens of the new Poland and Czechoslovakia to come in and have their property returned.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It takes them out of the class of alien enemies, and authorizes the restoration of their property?

Mr. NELSON. Yes. That is the main purpose of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 14208) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think the title of the bill ought to be changed so that it would read:

A bill for the relief of wealthy American women who have purchased titles of nobility prior to the war.

The Senator says that this is only one of the incidentals of the bill; that the main purpose of the bill is to assist Alsations and people of these new countries that have been created and allow them to come in now and claim their property. So far as that is concerned I am in hearty accord with it, but I am not in accord with the idea of relieving any American woman who was willing to sell her American citizenship for a German title. I do not care whether it was before the war or after the war. She marries a title. She has the wealth. The German nobleman wants the money. The American woman who has the money wants the title, and she is willing for that title to become a German citizen. She does so. The war breaks out and her property in the country where the wealth was made, in the good old United States, is taken possession of because she is an alien. She says, "Inasmuch as I was born in this country, even though I sold every right that I had as an American citizen for a Dutch title, I now want to get back my money in the United States." I, for one, would give her less consideration than I would give to the good German frau who happened to have property in the United States.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator, and if he can not answer, the chairman of the committee, whether or not the bill, properly interpreted, would give to an American woman who married a German and who has taken up her residence and maintained it in Germany, the restoration of her property? My understanding of the bill was that she had to remain in the United States in order to have the property returned, but if she went across the sea and took up her permanent abode in Germany she would come in the same category as other German nationals and would not be permitted to have the property restored.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not understand that she would regain American citizenship even.

Mr. KING. Then, if the Senator is right, I share the views of the Senator, and we ought to amend it in that respect.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, entertaining as I do the highest respect for the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] and for his judgment, and his wisdom, and his consideration in matters of great importance, I must confess that I am perfectly astounded at the remarks that he has just made. Why should a woman be penalized, even though she is an American, if her affections have been attracted by a foreigner? Why should a woman whose fortune has been made by her ancestors in this country have taken away from her under what the Supreme Court of the United States, speaking through the great Chief Justice Marshall, pronounced to be an act of land piracy if you took from her her fortune because, by the mere act of marriage, she is technically an alien enemy?

Mr. President, I think one of the most shameful things the American Government has ever performed was the renunciation of what we have always contended to be the moral and the decent international thing, that is, to preserve the rights of

aliens from conscription in the case of war, and when we passed the alien-property custodian act we did that. In my judgment, it is only because Germany has acquiesced, under the terms of the Versailles treaty, that property should remain in the custody of the United States for the discharge of the obligation which Germany owes to the United States, that it is defensible at all.

I have in my mind a case where a descendant of one of the earliest colonial families in my State did not marry a German title, as the Senator from North Dakota has suggested, but married a poor German professor in the University of Pennsylvania, and lost the fortune which her father and her grandfather and her great-grandfather had accumulated in Chester County, Pa., people whose names have been recorded in every phase of Pennsylvania history, and every phase of Pennsylvania activity, and every phase of Pennsylvania philosophy.

I am amazed, I am astounded—I will say no more—at the expressions of the Senator from North Dakota that this means the redeeming of the fortunes of American women who have married German titles.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I am not at all amazed at the deep interest the Senator from Pennsylvania is taking in this measure, when I find that his mind centers around some case which has happened in Pennsylvania, where somebody married a poor German professor, and whose money and the money of her father and her grandfather, and so forth, is held by the Alien Property Custodian. I will join the Senator from Pennsylvania in the return of the property taken from all the German alien enemies when the proper time comes and we have peace with that country. But I am opposed to making a distinction between those who were alien enemies because they had always lived in the Fatherland and those who became alien enemies because, as I said, in those cases they have married German titles and are now penalized because they have done so.

I think the most of the cases which are covered and to which relief will be granted by this bill will be the character of cases I have mentioned.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think this matter of returning the money in cases which have been described by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox] are entirely just, but they are not the main purpose of the bill. The main purpose of the bill, which has been very carefully prepared by the State Department and the Department of Justice, and to which the House has given a great deal of attention, and our Committee on the Judiciary, is to return money seized as of alien enemies to the people who are really not alien enemies, or technically so. Certainly if there are any people on the face of the earth to whom we ought to show every possible kindness, they are the people of Alsace-Lorraine, the people of Poland, whom we have recognized, the people of Czechoslovakia, and of the Slav Provinces of Austria, and also the people of what is called Italia Irredenta. There were probably no stronger friends of the cause against Germany than the people of the very territories I have described. It seems to me that this is a great act of justice, as well as kindness, and I sincerely hope that no objection will be made to the bill, but that it will be allowed to pass.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of the observation which I submitted a moment ago, I wish to make a few remarks concerning this measure.

I did not approve the principle of the bill which authorized the seizure of the property of German nationals within the United States. There could be no objection, perhaps, to the mere taking of the property; but we actually confiscated it. The United States entered into a treaty with the Kingdom of Prussia more than a hundred years ago, and under its terms each nation was to respect, not only in peace but in war, the property of nationals residing therein, and ample opportunity was to be afforded the nationals of each belligerent to remove their property from the alien territory.

It looked to me, Mr. President, that in the passage of the Alien Property Custodian act, notwithstanding Germany was our bitter enemy and a foe to civilization, we were somewhat lowering the high standard of international morality which had always been maintained by this Republic and which should always characterize a great Christian Nation such as the United States. I fear that we set a precedent which in the years to come may seriously affect the American people. We are a creditor Nation, and will have investments in all lands. We would suffer materially if this precedent were followed by other nations with which we might be at war.

But, Mr. President, having passed that act under which the property of German and Austrian nationals in the United States was seized, I see no reason why there should be the discrimination—and I address myself now to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox], so that he may not misunderstand my posi-



tion—between nationals born in Germany and those of American birth who have expatriated themselves. I see no reason why the property of Germans who were born in Germany and which we have seized should not be restored to them if we restore to women who were born in the United States, and who married Germans and who have expatriated themselves and taken up their residence in Germany, their property which was seized in the United States. That is my position. I do not think we ought to restore to a woman who married a German and went to Germany to reside, and is still residing there, the property which was seized here until we restore to other Germans the property of which we deprived them.

A law was enacted during the war which, as I recall, provided that American women who had married Germans but who resided in the United States and called this their home, and this was in fact their home, should be exempted from the operations of the Alien Property Custodian act. I was in favor of that; but I agree with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] that if an American woman married a German and went to Germany prior to the war and made it her home, and she was there during the war, so long as we retain the property of German nationals seized in the United States we should hold such property until we return the property of German nationals, if we shall take that course, and then we should restore it to her. We ought not to discriminate. That is my position.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the pending measure, authorizing the restitution by the President of property taken from those who were technically alien enemies during the war, has been most thoroughly considered by the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the Alien Property Custodian. In the Committee on the Judiciary for the last two days we have heard Assistant Secretary Polk, we have heard agents of the Department of Justice, and we have heard the Alien Property Custodian. While I am perfectly free to admit that in dealing with this rather complicated question I would like to have had more time and more opportunity to examine into the details of the somewhat complicated provisions of the bill, still, in view of the fact that all three of these departments have given it special attention, and relying upon the statement of Secretary Polk that it is of the utmost importance to have the legislation now so that the people who are really entitled to a refund of their money and who are in extremis and have been for some time, instead of waiting until next December and then taking up the subject *de novo*, and in view of the fact that the bill has been passed by the House of Representatives, I have given the measure my support.

There are whole races of people whose nationals were caught in this country at the time we entered the war and who were then technically alien enemies, and citizens of all the new nations which have achieved their liberties in Europe and are now our friends. The great Republics of Czechoslovakia and Poland have been recognized by us as fellow republics, and we are entertaining ambassadors and ministers from those countries.

I do not doubt that if each Senator is to dissect the bill he can bring up some particular feature of it that he would like to have different. Indeed there were cases adduced in the committee hearings where I was not entirely satisfied that the terms of the bill could not be improved upon; but, as I said, as between the alternative of leaving the entire subject in its present condition, with so much injustice outstanding for months longer, and the possibility that some money may be paid to some one that may not be entirely justified—as between those two horns of the dilemma I believe in accepting the judgment of the departments of the Government which have given it so much consideration.

Indeed it is my own judgment that the races and the circumstances involving so many nationalities, situated so differently, can not all be taken care of with absolute justice and equity under the provisions of any bill that we could prepare. I very much hope that the bill may be allowed to pass. If there is anything wrong about it, the President will veto it. I do not see how we can, at least at this session, evolve anything better suited to the circumstances.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. The Senator will remember that during the numerous sessions of the Committee on the Judiciary in 1917 and 1918 there was evidence before us, if not positive and direct evidence at least evidence of a hearsay and indirect nature, but of such character and authenticity that we accepted it as genuine, that many American women who had married Germans

and were living in Germany were more hostile, if possible, to the United States than German women themselves; that their alliance with German husbands seemed to have destroyed all affection for the land of their nativity.

Now, does not the Senator think that women of that class, who have taken up their abode there, who lived there and who had nothing to do with this country, ought to be exempted from the operations of the bill, that they ought to abide in the same category as German nationals and get their property, if they get it at all, when German nationals get their property? Does not the Senator think we ought to amend the bill so as to make that clear?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not think we ought to attempt to amend the bill, because I do not think we can possibly obtain any information which would correct such cases as the Senator has suggested, whether they exist or not.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator from Connecticut a question?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. There was some discussion, I think, during the war concerning the Busch estate—the great brewery wealth that has accumulated in the United States—and where, if I remember rightly, the heir to that enormous fortune—a daughter—was married to one of the principal stockholders in the Krupp gun manufacturing establishment of Germany. Her husband's main interest was in the manufacture of implements of war to kill American soldiers and the soldiers of other nationalities against which Germany was waging war.

If that be true, I wish to ask the Senator if he does not really think that the German women who are not expatriated have just as much right to call for their husbands' estates over in the United States, if they had an interest, as the heir of both the Krupp interests and the Busch interests in the United States, after having expatriated herself as an American citizen, to now come and seek to obtain her property rights, as though she had never been a German citizen at all?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not think the Senator from North Dakota is in a very judicial frame of mind when he mentions the subject of Germany. The war is over in fact, even if the conditions of the settlement have not been properly adjusted, but I am not disposed to confiscate the fortunes of women who fell in love with foreigners without my approval or consent. They suited themselves about it, and they were not considering it at the time as a matter of international law, or did not see quite what they were becoming involved in, possibly, even matrimonially or internationally. Perhaps that is not an uncommon condition.

But this Government is not waging war against women now at any rate. What is the use of talking? These American girls, for their own reason or lack of reason or for no reason at all, fell in love with some foreigners and married them. I do not suppose it entered the head of one in twenty of them to inquire whether they lost their citizenship or anything about it. Many of them have their properties in trust. After a while war breaks out with some foreign power, and if their husbands happen to be located within the boundaries of the country against which we declare war, we confiscate all their property in this country, turn it over to an Alien Property Custodian, sell all the property, possibly, and invest the proceeds in our Liberty bonds to wage war against the country to which they belong, and we classify them technically as alien enemies. They may or may not be enemies at all actually. They may be very sorry that they ever got married, but there they are and their property is taken from them.

How is it possible by an act of legislation or judicial inquiry, even if we had the time to make it, to ascertain whether any American girls who married men who were German nationals, so classified, felt more bitter toward this country than their husbands did, or whether their husbands felt more bitter toward this country simply because they were living here and not naturalized citizens, but may have been college professors, or rich or poor? I can not conceive how we can go into those details.

It is utterly impossible to ascertain the sentiments of the feminine heart and how they felt in 1917 when we entered the war. If a woman is married to a man, she has promised to give up all and follow him, and as between domestic infelicity and getting into trouble with some Alien Property Custodian or inspector, she will probably move along the lines of least resistance. I am not a sufficient psychoanalyst to ascertain the absolute truth about all these questions. But this is the best attempt that three great departments of the Government, concerned with this complicated matter, could make toward a solution. I wish they were more satisfactory, but it is this or nothing. That is the situation. We adjourn to-morrow. The

House has passed the bill. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary would probably have made some amendments to it if they had not been afraid they would imperil the whole bill. So we swallowed our objections to it, and think we had better do the best we can instead of failing in everything in struggling after the unattainable.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the expert testimony of the Senator from Connecticut upon the sentiments of the female heart appeals to me very strongly, in the light of his long experience, and prompts me to abate my antagonism to the feature of the bill to which I referred.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I was appealing to the gallantry of the Senator.

Mr. KING. I move to amend—

Mr. LODGE. That would simply kill the bill.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether this is a House bill?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, yes; it is a House bill.

Mr. NELSON. I trust the Senator will not attempt to amend the bill, because at this stage of the session, if we amend the bill and send it over to the House, it would undoubtedly lead to its defeat. I trust the Senator will not do that.

I wish to call the attention of the Senator in this connection to the following language:

And that money or other property concerned was not acquired by such women, either directly or indirectly, from any subject or citizen of Germany or Austria-Hungary.

The same provision applies to the other class of women—those who married alien enemies. In view of those facts, which simply relate to the property of these American women, their own property, not the property that they acquired in any shape or manner from their husbands, I appeal to the generosity of the Senator not to make any effort to amend the bill at this stage. If it was earlier in the session and we had more time, it would not be of much consequence, because it could be easily settled in conference, but now, at this time, to put an amendment on the bill would simply imperil its enactment into law.

Mr. KING. I, of course, would dislike to prevent the passage of the bill. It has so much of merit that I feel that the bill ought to be enacted into law. The section that I have been discussing needs some amendment, and I regret very much that the situation may prevent it. I wish to suggest, however, to the Senator that I think it should be amended in line 21, after the words "Austria-Hungary," so as to read:

And who since said marriage has continuously resided in the United States.

So that it would provide that American women who married Germans or Austro-Hungarians, but who resided in the United States, would obtain their property; but if they deliberately went overseas, cast their lot—and I am not complaining of them for so doing; it was, perhaps, their duty to do so—with their husbands in foreign lands, and lived there continuously, I see no reason why their property should be restored to them when we refuse to restore to other German nationals or Austro-Hungarian nationals their property. We are making a discrimination that is not warranted in morals and not warranted in law if we pass the bill unamended with the provision which came from the other House. I suggest that amendment to my distinguished friend from Minnesota and my friend from Connecticut and ask them to accept it.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I can readily see that the Senator from Utah is actuated by the best of purposes and motives, and were conditions different I would gladly acquiesce in the amendment, and the matter might then be disposed of in conference; but at this late stage of the session to amend the bill in a material respect would imperil its passage. In view of the great good which can be accomplished by this bill for the people of Alsace-Lorraine, for the people of Bohemia, of Moravia, of Poland, and of Italia Irredenta, I trust the Senator from Utah will forego insisting on any amendment to it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I will yield to the appeals of the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Connecticut, but I want to tell them that they are supporting discriminatory legislation. This bill establishes a bad precedent, and they may live to regret it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator from Utah, if he will allow me, that I think the statistics will show that at least 90 per cent of the property that is to be returned to foreigners will be to American women, and not to Alsations, Poles, and others.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, in the closing hours of the session last night the Senate passed the bill reclassifying and readjusting salaries and compensation of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service. The debate on this bill was very limited, due primarily on the part of Senators to the fact that there was little opposition and the general desire to place upon the statutes the necessary relief which this legislation provides.

As one of the members of the joint commission appointed under the provision of the act approved February 28, 1919, I do not want this opportunity to pass without a word of tribute to the guiding spirit who conceived the thought and instituted the plan the result of which has just been accomplished.

It was Senator Bankhead, of Alabama. Mr. President, who, as chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, knew the conditions of the service perhaps more intimately than anyone else and the distressing needs of those who have chosen for their life work that most important branch of the Government service, more intimately associated with the business, wealth and social welfare than any other.

The late Senator Bankhead believed in a substantial increase for the men who have been the poorest paid employees of the Government and who at all times have been faithful and patriotic. The work of the commission was delayed for a period by the last illness and death of its able and distinguished chairman, and each member of the commission felt a personal loss when the Hon. John H. Bankhead was called to his final reward.

Mr. President, legislation is seldom, if ever, perfect. It is largely the result of compromise, and certain it is that the bill readjusting the salaries in the Postal Service will meet with much adverse criticism and disappointment in some quarters, where hope and expectation had stimulated the belief that the report would be commensurate with the present high cost of living.

The commission, after conducting extensive hearings in many of the great postal centers of the United States where employees associated with every branch of the Postal Service were given an opportunity to be heard and after inspecting conditions and the nature and character of duties performed by the various groups of employees, feel that they have reached fair conclusions.

Some of the salaries and compensation are not as high or remunerative as some of us would have liked, but the commission felt that we were not legislating alone for present conditions and were anxious to secure immediate legislation to take effect and give relief at the beginning of the coming fiscal year on July 1.

I can not let this opportunity pass without mentioning the splendid and efficient work of the secretary of the commission, Mr. C. A. Beasley, who has been faithful at all times and to whom great credit is due.

It is to be hoped that the result of this legislation will mean greater efficiency in the Postal Service and give the necessary relief to those worthy employees of the Government who have patiently waited for justice and proper remuneration.

#### FORCE AND SALARIES IN PATENT OFFICE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11984) to increase the force and salaries in the Patent Office, and for other purposes.

Mr. NORRIS obtained the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. I suggest the absence of a quorum, as other Senators have informed me that they wish to know when the Senate resumes the consideration of a bill of the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Smoot
Brandegee	Kenyon	Page	Sutherland
Capper	Keyes	Phipps	Thomas
Comer	Knox	Pittman	Underwood
Curtis	Lodge	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Gay	McCumber	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Hale	McNary	Reed	Wolcott
Harding	Nelson	Sheppard	
Harrison	New	Simmons	
Henderson	Norris	Smith, Md.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUTHERLAND in the chair). Thirty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. PHELAN, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. STERLING, Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. TRAMMELL, and Mr. WADSWORTH answered to their names when called.



Mr. BECKHAM, Mr. DIAL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FERNALD, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. FALL, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. CALDER, Mr. WARREN, Mr. STANLEY, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, and Mr. ROBINSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there are several committee amendments that are not printed. Since the first reading has been dispensed with, I should like to take up the committee amendments in their order. If the clerks at the desk will follow me, I will state the amendments.

The first amendment is on line 7, page 1 of the bill, where I move to strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 8, page 1, strike out "\$5,500" and insert "\$4,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 10, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On page 2, line 1, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 7, page 2, strike out "\$4,000" in both places where it appears in the line, and insert in each place in lieu thereof "\$3,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 8, page 2, strike out "\$4,200" and insert "\$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 9, strike out "\$3,900" and insert "\$3,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 10, strike out "\$3,900" and insert "\$3,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 17, page 2, strike out "\$3,900" and insert "\$3,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 18, after the word "at" where it first appears, strike out "\$3,300" and insert "\$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. In the same line, strike out "\$3,100" and insert "\$2,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 19, strike out "\$2,900" and insert "\$2,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 20, strike out "\$2,800" and insert "\$2,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On the same line, strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$2,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On the same line, strike out "\$2,350" and insert "\$2,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 21, strike out "\$2,200" and insert "\$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 22, strike out "\$2,050" and insert "\$1,925."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On the same line, strike out "\$1,925" and insert "\$1,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 23, strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$1,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On page 3, line 1, strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$2,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 2, strike out "\$2,700" and insert "\$2,500."

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. These are substantial changes in the bill as it is now pending before the Senate. I should like to ask the Senator how the salaries as amended will compare with the salaries now being paid?

Mr. NORRIS. There will be an increase.

Mr. POMERENE. Of approximately how much?

Mr. NORRIS. It is difficult for me to tell the Senator that. I can give him the information by looking up the figures in regard to any one of them, or some of them.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the increase will average about 25 per cent; some of them will be increased a little more than 25 per cent, and some of them over a third, or about a third, and some of them less than 25 per cent.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that the committee agreed to these changes, not because they thought all the changes ought to be made, though some of them probably ought to be made, but there are some of the salaries in the bill as it passed the House that do not correspond to similar salaries in other bureaus and departments. Now, it will very likely be the object of the conferees to make these salaries correspond. If the amendments we are making here do not do it in all the cases, I presume the conferees will come to that kind of an agreement.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I simply want to make this observation: I happen to know something about the operations of the Patent Office as it existed some years ago, and I think there has been a general feeling among patent lawyers and those who are particularly interested in that department that the salaries paid to examiners and men of that type have been very much below what they ought to be.

Mr. NORRIS. There is not any doubt about it.

Mr. POMERENE. And as a result of these very low salaries, many of the best men who have been employed in this department have been attracted elsewhere by employers and inventors and by patent-law officers, and so forth.

Mr. NORRIS. That is true.

Mr. POMERENE. I think that if the Patent Office is to be administered as it should be, we ought to bear those facts in mind and take counsel of them.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with every word that the Senator says; and what he has said about the facts as existing there I think is undisputed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in that connection, if the Senator will yield for just a moment—

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. So that the Senator may have some idea as to the increases paid to the examiners, I wish to say that I am of the same opinion as the Senator from Ohio in relation to the past salaries paid to the examiners, and these are the increases as reported. The Senator will remember that in 1916 we passed a bill increasing the compensation of the employees of the Patent Office, and the figures I shall give the Senator here in regard to examiners are the salaries paid before 1916 and in the current appropriation and under this bill.

Take the principal examiners: Before 1916 they received \$2,500. In the current appropriation they receive \$2,700 and in the House bill \$3,900, and the compromise is \$3,500; or, in other words, that is an increase over what they had before 1916 of \$1,000 a year.

The salaries of the first assistant examiners before 1916 were \$1,800. The current law gives them \$2,400 and the proposed increase runs from \$2,900 to \$3,300, and that was reduced to \$2,700 to \$3,000.

The second assistant examiners before 1916 received \$1,600. In the current law they receive \$2,100, and the proposed increases of the House were \$2,350 to \$2,800, and, of course, they have been compromised by a reduction of about \$150 to \$200.

Mr. KING. Two thousand seven hundred dollars?

Mr. SMOOT. About that.

I might continue, but for the other classes of examiners the increases are about the same percentage as those of which I have already spoken.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not remember whether we had voted on the amendment on line 2, page 3. The amendment is to strike out "\$2,700" and insert "\$2,500." Has that amendment been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not yet been agreed to. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, unfortunately I was called from the Chamber for a moment, and, if the Senator will pardon me, I should like to recur to the first item.

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. KING. What, if any, amendment was offered by the Senator dealing with the first item of \$6,000?

Mr. NORRIS. It was reduced to \$5,000.

Mr. KING. And the second item, \$5,500?

Mr. NORRIS. It was reduced to \$4,500.

Mr. KING. And the third item, \$5,000?

Mr. NORRIS. It was reduced to \$4,000.

Mr. KING. And the five examiners in chief, \$5,000 each?

Mr. NORRIS. That is reduced to \$4,000.

Mr. KING. That is an increase of substantially 30 per cent over existing law?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. They are getting \$3,500 now. That is an increase of \$500.

Mr. KING. And the chief clerk—what reduction has been made by the Senator in his salary?

Mr. NORRIS. The "chief clerk—who shall be qualified to act as principal examiner"—was reduced from \$4,000 to \$3,500.

Mr. KING. And the six law examiners?

Mr. NORRIS. The same reduction.

Mr. KING. The examiner of classification?

Mr. NORRIS. From \$4,200 to \$4,000.

Mr. KING. Two examiners of interference, whatever that may be?

Mr. NORRIS. They are reduced from \$3,900 to \$3,300 each.

Mr. KING. Examiner of trade-marks and designs?

Mr. NORRIS. That is not changed.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not changed from the House provision, but it is increased over the current law.

Mr. NORRIS. I am speaking of the House provision. The figures I am giving the Senator are amendments to which the Senate has already agreed, while the Senator was out of the Chamber.

Mr. KING. So I have been advised. Does the Senator think that the amendments thus far agreed to, in view of the changes which have been made heretofore in their salaries, and the increase, as I understand, in 1916, which was very substantial, will comport with the other salaries paid in the various departments of the Government?

Mr. NORRIS. Since I, as representing the committee, compromised on the amendments which have been offered and agreed to, I have not had an opportunity to examine in order to determine how they will compare; but that is what the committee want to do. In other words, they want anyone in the Patent Office who is doing the same kind of work, and possesses the same kind of qualifications, as some one in the Post Office Department, to get the same salary.

Mr. KING. It occurs to me that a number of these amounts are very materially greater than those allowed in other departments for similar services.

Mr. NORRIS. There are some which ought to be greater. When there is a position which requires a particular scientific knowledge or technical training, which is not required of an ordinary clerk, the man who fills it ought to get, in my judgment, a larger salary than a man who has not spent the time and money to qualify himself for such a position.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator entirely.

Mr. NORRIS. There are a great many technical employees in the Patent Office, although they are designated as clerks.

Mr. KING. Does the bill increase the number of employees?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and that is absolutely essential. Let me say to the Senator, however, that the bill also increases the fees of the Patent Office, so that the increase in the salaries provided for in the bill, even if these reductions had not been made, would much more than be provided for in the increased income of the office.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, that would not warrant any increase in the personnel if it was not imperatively demanded.

Mr. NORRIS. I admit that. I simply wanted the Senator and the Senate to know that although there are increases in salaries and increases in the number of employees, it is not going to cost the taxpayers of the country anything to bring that about. That would not be justified, of course, unless the conditions demanded it.

Mr. KING. Of course, the burden which will result from the increased compensation must rest upon somebody. It will be paid by those seeking patents.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; it will.

Mr. KING. And they in turn will pass the increase along to the ultimate consumer, so that finally the ultimate consumer, the laboring man, or whoever the consumer is, will have to pay it.

Mr. NORRIS. A man who gets a patent and pays \$20 for it instead of \$15 will probably not be able to pass on that \$5 to the people who buy the article which is patented. He will pass on the cost whether he pays that fee or not. It will not make any difference in what the ultimate consumer pays; but the change making the increase will bring in a very large sum of money.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, of course, without entering into a discussion of economics, whatever increase there is in any activity, somebody has to pay for it, and finally it will be distributed among the producers and consumers of the country. The wage earner and the consumer ultimately have to pay the

increases, no matter in what segment of our society or social organism that increase may be manifest.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator states an economic principle broadly, and states it well and truly; but, like all rules, it has some exceptions. I think this will be one. If the Senator paid \$20 for his patent instead of \$15 and manufactured a million of the patented articles, he would never think about what the patent cost him. It would be so small in computing his returns that it could not be put in figures. I was in favor of increasing the fee another \$5, but the committee did not agree. It is not a hardship, and we ought to recognize the fact that everything has gone up in price. We have to pay larger salaries; we ought to pay them. We have to pay them, particularly in an office of this kind, or we can not get the work done. The man who buys a patent right has to pay more for it. Everything has gone up, and he ought to pay a little higher fee for getting it, I think, in recognition of the general rise in all kinds of values.

Mr. KING. Of course, I agree with the Senator in that, and yet, if the Senator will pardon an interruption, in many expenditures now, whether it be for salaries of employees of the Government or for any other purpose of the Government, we ought to take into account not alone existing high prices, but the low level of prices which inevitably will be reached in the near future. I think that it is unwise for us to predicate our appropriations and our economic anticipations upon the standard of prices to-day. Pretty soon we will have erected a scaffold upon which we will be standing alone, if I may be permitted the expression, and the tide of moving activity in business and social intercourse will be far below. I think there ought to be flexibility. If there are increases in any of the appropriations for salaries there ought to be flexibility now, so that there may be adjustments with the changes which will occur in our industrial, our financial, and our economic policies.

Let me ask the Senator whether there is any necessity for this increase of the personnel, and I make that inquiry in view of statements made to me by persons who claim to be familiar with the workings of this department? I have no knowledge whatever upon the subject, but they aver that there are sufficient employees, with reasonable diligence and zeal upon their part, to fully perform all of the work incident to the office.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no hesitancy, Mr. President, in informing the Senator that he has been misinformed. Of course, I have not been down and made a study personally of the Patent Office, and I do not know enough about the details of it to give much information if I had been there, but the Senate committee listened to a great deal of evidence, and so did the House committee. A great many figures and a great many facts were submitted to show that the Patent Office is really now in a deplorable condition. They are short now. They are unable to handle the business, and it is not up to date. We had called to our attention the necessity frequently of prompt action, and what was required in the examination of records in various sorts of cases, and in litigation that might come up, where it was a physical impossibility for the force at hand to conduct them within the time fixed, and they had to go to court and get extensions of time for taking depositions and all sorts of things of that kind.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator has just stated that they were very short of help. May I ask the Senator if that has not been the condition in the Patent Office for many years?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but it is very acute now, because the business of the office has increased very rapidly.

I may call the attention of the Senate to one instance, which shows why they can not keep their employees: In the Patent Office under existing law they have only 10 clerks of class 4, 10 clerks of class 3, 19 clerks of class 2, and 137 clerks of class 1. There is not any way to promote, no matter how efficient they may become, from one grade to the other, because, as you see, the law only authorizes 10 clerks of class 4, and they have to have experts in those lines. Just compare that with some of the other bureaus. The Indian Office has 18 clerks of class 4, 8 more than the Patent Office. The Pension Office has 87, while this office has only 10. The Land Office has 37, the Internal-Revenue Bureau has 52, and so on.

Mr. President, the next amendment is, on page 3, line 3, to strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$2,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. The next amendment is on the same page, line 4, to strike out "\$2,100" and insert "\$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. In line 6, the same page, after the word "languages," I move to strike out "\$2,400" and insert "\$2,200."

The amendment was agreed to.



Mr. NORRIS. The next amendment is on the same page, line 8, after the word "four," to strike out "at \$1,800 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. The next amendment is on page 3, commencing with the last word on line 8 and ending with the word "each" on line 9, striking out the words "at \$1,600 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator whether the clerks—and I use that term in a sort of generic sense—are not paid more in this executive division than in other executive divisions of the Government; and, if there is a discrimination, whether there is any justification for it?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think there is any discrimination, if I understand the Senator's question. A clerk of class 4, for instance, gets the same salary everywhere as do clerks of class 3, of class 2, or of class 1, as the case may be, no matter what bureau or department they may be in, although in this office particularly a clerk may be required to have qualifications far superior to those of a clerk of the same class in another bureau.

Mr. KING. While I have the floor, may I ask the Senator, in view of the fact that we have a reclassification bill on the calendar, which is the result of months of laborious work upon the part of a joint commission, which work was aided by experts of standing and ability and integrity, does the Senator think we ought to ignore that report and take up the various parts of that report in a piecemeal way? If we deal with one branch of the Government service to-day and another tomorrow, it seems to me that it would entirely disarrange the plan which was formulated by the joint commission, and would lead to many injustices and compel the rearrangement and readjustment and recoordination, if I may be permitted the expression, of all the work which they have performed.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in one sense the Senator is right, but I would like to call his attention to two things: First, this legislation passed through the House and was considered by the Senate committee and reported to the Senate before the bill of which the Senator speaks was introduced. I have not had an opportunity or time to compare what is in this bill with what is in the other. The Senator would have been impressed, if he had been on the committee and had listened to the hearings, and he would recognize that more important than what he has said is the emergency which the committee felt exists in the Patent Office. It has been an emergency for some time, but it never was so acute as now. A good many of the best men have left; there are other good men remaining who have, many of them, had offers in private business, from various corporations and organizations, which like and have to have the employment of scientific men in their particular lines, at higher wages; and those men are still remaining. They are not getting enough to support themselves and their families in the city of Washington now. They can not always stand that. I was informed just a day or two ago by one of the principal officers of the Patent Office that on a careful investigation they had found quite a number of their employees who had said, "I can not permanently remain where I am at the salary which I am getting. If the Senate will even pass the bill so that it gets into conference I will have a hope that some time during the next session this increase will be given, and I am going to hang on and stay." They persuade these men to stay who are good, because the men realize that they are very much handicapped. There are a great many men, some of the best men in the Patent Office, who are in that position. They have a patriotic feeling, they like their work, they want to stay there, and they realize the damage it would be to the people and the country if they accepted these offers of higher salaries and left. So that there is a real emergency confronting us in this office.

The Senator knows what it means to have a comprehensive bill like the one which has been introduced, that applies to all the salaries of all the employees of the Government, and that it will probably be two or three years before it is enacted into law. In the meantime the Patent Office would be defunct. When that is enacted, if it ever occurs, any changes of present salaries as provided for in this legislation, of course, would take effect just the same as though we had not changed those salaries.

So I feel, and I feel very deeply. The Senator realizes that I have no interest whatever in the legislation except as a Member of this body and a citizen of the country. I have no interest in my State involved in it in any way, or any of my constituents, nor have any of the other members of the committee. We did pass last night, and we were careful to pass it so it

became a law, a bill introduced long after this one was. It did not get on the calendar until long after this one. That applied to the Post Office Department, of course a larger department and covering more territory and having a lot of voters in it, while this has not. We saw to it that those salaries were increased, while all the distance we want to travel in this case is to get the bill in conference, assuming we get the bill through here before we adjourn.

Mr. KING. May I trespass for a moment upon the Senator's time? I agree, of course, with the Senator's general observation that conditions in the country have called for an increase in the compensation of employees, and I have in a number of instances, where I have been acquainted with manufacturers and the heads of corporations and persons who have been engaged in large business, communicated with them and urged that there be a liberal increase in the compensation allowed employees.

It has been apparent during this orgy of high prices that many employees of the Government, as well as hundreds of thousands in private business, have been inadequately compensated. They have suffered, they have been unable out of the wages received to live properly and to properly support and educate their children. This condition has been most unfortunate. A proper wage must be paid to all, and the human element should be the paramount consideration in all proper legislation as well as in the relations between individuals and communities.

I have felt with respect to Government employees that during this reign of high prices we ought to make liberal contributions in the shape of annual bonuses or allowances, whatever they may be denominated, that would measurably meet these high prices and the requirements of the employees. I have believed that it was unwise to fix a rigid system during the period of flux the same as it would be unwise for a manufacturer or a vendor of goods to fix a rigid price for the commodities sold to the public. There is a fluid condition, an unstable condition, in the economic and in the industrial world. I believe that it will prove to be the wiser and better policy and prove fairer to the employee and to the country if in dealing with the question of salaries and compensation those having to deal with the matter fix no inflexible policy now. There should be generous annual appropriations by way of bonuses or increased compensation until a condition of stability, or reasonable stability, is reached; then a general law may be enacted by the Government dealing in a just and liberal manner with all its employees.

I was in sympathy with the proposition to appoint a reclassification commission and believed that its work would be helpful and prove of real benefit to the country and to the employees.

Since their report has been submitted I have believed that it would be better not to consider separately branches of the Government service treated in the report, but if the question of salaries and classification was considered the entire report should be taken up. If we deal separately with certain employees there is danger of dislocating the proposed plan, of marring if not destroying the work of the commission. Eventually we would be compelled to readjust their entire work with a view to coordinating it with the work which the Congress had done in making changes in the various classes of employees of the Government.

I think the Senator by his confession has conceded that there is some danger of that. The Senator has said there is an exigency here which calls for this legislation. I should like to say to the Senator that in many business activities in the United States there is an exigency. The agriculturists of the United States are in an extremely dangerous situation. Their employees have flocked to the cities because the automobile establishments and manufacturing plants are paying large wages, and many individuals have left positions of permanent employment, positions which they have held for years and which promised them permanent employment for the future, enticed by the high wages, temporary in character, offered in some new line of employment.

I suggest to the Senator, by way of inquiry, whether it is opportune to enact permanent legislation dealing with wages when conditions are abnormal and violent mutations are of daily occurrence.

A year will produce profound changes in the industrial condition of the United States and of the world. Within a year or two many of those who have left the Government service and have left positions in private employment will be crowding back, asking for their old positions in the Government service as well as in private service.

It is obvious that when prices fall, when the price of manufactures and farm products come down, when the price of

living is reduced, wages will fall. I hope wages will never reach the low levels of the past. There must be a due regard for the laborer, for the farmer, for the producer of wealth. I confess I feel a greater interest in those who add by their labors and toil to the wealth and comfort and happiness of the world than in any other class of society.

Mr. NORRIS. The next amendment which I propose is, in line 10, page 3, to strike out the words "at \$1,200 each."

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that on line 9 the words "at \$1,400 each" ought to be stricken out.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that ought to be done. I move that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 3, line 9, after the words "class 2," strike out the words "at \$1,400 each."

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator if the reason these figures are to be eliminated is found in the fact that the existing law covers the compensation?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; the words are surplusage; they do not mean anything.

Mr. SMOOT. They are statutory positions.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. In line 10, page 3, I move to strike out the words "at \$1,200 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. In line 11, page 3, I move to strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$1,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. In line 12, page 3, I move to amend by striking out "\$1,600" and inserting "\$1,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. In line 12, page 3, I move to amend by striking out "\$1,400" and inserting "\$1,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. In line 13, page 3, I move to amend by striking out "\$1,100" and inserting "\$900."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. In line 14, page 3, I move to strike out "\$1,080" in both places in the line and in each case insert "\$840" in lieu thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. In line 15, after the word "aids," I move to insert the words "at \$720 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. In line 16, page 3, I move to amend by striking out "\$720" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$500."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. New in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator, in view of the large clerical force provided above, whether there is any necessity for so large a force of copyists, messengers, and so on, as has just been provided for? For instance, I notice here 100 clerks of a certain class, 125 of another class, and 100 of another class. It seems to me, with so large a clerical force, it would not require the additional number of employees provided for other positions. It is sometimes possible to determine the number of clerks and the number who might be denominated as subclerks required with reference to the superior officers in the organization. It seems to me this bill is rather "top-heavy" in the "lower structure," if I may be permitted an "Irishism."

Mr. NORRIS. The committee, of course, does not want to get any more employees than are necessary to do the business, but we have to rely upon the evidence. I was going to give the Senator the exact figures. The members of the committee were impressed with the fact, from all our investigations, that this increase of employees is necessary to do the work. I confess I was dumbfounded when I learned from the evidence of the condition that the business is in at the Patent Office at the present time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, right there I wish to say—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I had no idea that there was to be such an increase in the number of employees in the Patent Office when the Senator and I were talking about compensation, but I see from the report there is a very great increase in the number of all of the employees.

Mr. NORRIS. No; there is a reduction as to one class.

Mr. SMOOT. I am taking them as a whole. Of course, the reduction comes about by reducing the number in the class receiving lower salaries and increasing their compensation.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. That is how the reduction comes about; but, on the whole, the number is increased.

I desire to say to the Senator from Nebraska that when the legislative appropriation bill was under consideration an estimate came from the Patent Office stating the number of clerks and the number of examiners and others of that class of employees which they desired by way of increase. The Senate allowed the number of employees estimated for through the Secretary of the Treasury, which was an increase in the number of employees provided for by the House. It is true that afterwards a supplemental estimate was submitted which asked for a few more employees, but that request was not granted by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. However, we did give them the number originally estimated for through the Treasury Department. The increase in the number of employees is so great, as proposed in this bill, that I have wondered whether the Senator from Nebraska had made a careful study of the matter and whether he thinks the number asked for is really necessary.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have to say to the Senator, as I did to his colleague, that I have no personal knowledge of those cases. For instance, let me call the attention of the Senate to some of the increases in the number of employees. At the present time, under existing law, there are only 10 clerks of class 4. The man who realizes what it means to be in a department where one can work until he is grayheaded without any opportunity or chance of being promoted can see at a glance what that means to a clerk in a lower class. There is no chance of promotion. Under the law to which the senior Senator from Utah refers, the number of employees was increased to 11; so that, under House bill 1251, the legislative appropriation bill, which I understand has been signed by the President, 11 clerks of class 4 are provided for.

Mr. SMOOT. But this bill proposes to provide for 22.

Mr. NORRIS. By this bill it is proposed to provide for 22 of class 4.

Mr. SMOOT. That is double the number.

Mr. NORRIS. They will have 11 when the legislative bill goes into effect. They only have 10 now; and they will also have 11 of class 3. The pending bill gives them 33.

Mr. SMOOT. Three times the present number?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir; and there ought to be three times the present number, as I understand the situation.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that the Commissioner of Patents could not go to the Secretary of the Treasury and secure an estimate for such an increase in the number of employees, and the Commissioner of Patents knew that he could not do it.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, I do not know whether or not he could do so now, but I have an idea that if the provision is in the law he will be able to get them.

Mr. SMOOT. If we pass this bill he will be able to do so, but what I mean to say is that the Commissioner of Patents could not go to the Secretary of the Treasury and get an estimate for submission to Congress and to the Appropriations Committee asking for that increased number of employees.

Now, I will say to the Senator that for the next fiscal year we gave the Patent Office in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which the President has signed, the increased number asked for in the original estimate which was sent to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury. While, as I have said, subsequently there was an application for a few more employees, it did not include anything like the increased number now proposed.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there is one thing, particularly in an office like the Patent Office, that I think will be apparent to any fair-minded man who will give honest consideration to the matter, and that is that there ought to be a larger number of clerks of class 4 and of class 3 than in any other ordinary office of the Government, because they need experts in that office, men who are qualified and trained. Such men are much more valuable than the ordinary clerks, and the Patent Office ought to have them. Yet they must be designated under the law as clerks, and unless they may be promoted to the higher classes they can not be properly compensated, and the Patent Office can not retain their services.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is mistaken as to that. The clerk in the Patent Office is doing exactly the same work that the clerk in any other department of the Government is doing. The increase that is really needed is in the number of examiners.



They are the specialists; they are the ones who do the technical work; and in the appropriation bill to which I have referred, in accordance with the estimate, there has been provided an increase in the number of principal examiners from 45 to 47. Then there has been provided an increase in the number of first assistant examiners from 90 to 100, and in the number of second assistant examiners from 90 to 100.

Mr. NORRIS. From what line and page is the Senator from Utah reading?

Mr. SMOOT. I am now reading from the current appropriation.

Mr. NORRIS. I thought the Senator was reading from the pending bill.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am reading from the current appropriation bill in connection with the appropriation bill for the next fiscal year and showing the number of increases in each class as named. In other words, Mr. President, the current law provides 90 first assistant examiners, 90 second assistant examiners, 90 third assistant examiners, and 90 fourth assistant examiners, and all four of those classes have been increased by 10 examiners each, making in the examining force of the Patent Office in those four classes of employees an increase of 40. I wish to say to the Senator that the Commissioner of Patents never would have come here and made such a request of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. Just a moment. Yet, if we are going to increase the number of employees in the Patent Office, the increase ought to be in the force of examiners; I recognize that fact; but here is an increase of over 10 per cent in the number of employees. I am not now complaining of the increase that we have agreed upon in the compensation of the examiners, because they are technical men; they have to prepare themselves for this special work; but when it comes to a clerk of the fourth class or of the third class or of the second class or of the first class, they do exactly the same work and keep the books in the Patent Office just as similar clerks perform similar services in the Interior Department, in the office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in the Bureau of the General Land Office, or any other bureau or department of the Government, and they are paid the same.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me say to the senior Senator from Utah and also to the junior Senator from Utah, both of whom are complaining about the number of the employees in the Patent Office, that I feel, and I think the committee feels, that we have not given them too many; but if it be true that the Secretary of the Treasury has refused to estimate for the larger number and that they can not use that number, then will the Senators agree to the amendment which I am about to suggest, with the explanation that the conferees will take that question up directly with the proper officials of the Government and ascertain, if they can, what increase will be sufficient? The amendment I have in mind will reduce the number of some of the clerks, and, if adopted, would go to conference with the understanding I have indicated.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing that that shall be done, and I think that when the Senator makes the investigation—and I know that he will make it if he says he will—he will find that the increase in the number of employees as provided in this bill is altogether too great.

Mr. NORRIS. I am making this proposition because we have not changed the House text, and unless we do something of that kind it can not be changed in conference.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true; the Senator is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, I will say that I am quite desirous for the reason which I have already stated to provide an increased number of clerks in certain classes. Everyone must concede that there ought to be a much larger number of clerks of class 3 and 4, because it takes away the initiative, it takes away the ambition of a clerk when he gets in an office to realize that no promotion is in his way, and that he has to depend upon a small number above him, 10, for instance, to resign or to die in order that he may be advanced.

I have known for years that the Patent Office is one of the poorest places in the Government service in which to secure promotion, and for that reason they are not able to keep the good clerks, for they try to get in some other office. That condition has arisen because of the fact that they are so few of the higher class of clerks, and it was hardly possible to secure promotion, no matter how efficient the employee might be.

Mr. SMOOT. There is another reason for that, namely, that the clerks in the Patent Office are provided for and enumerated in the law; in other words, they fall under the statutory roll; whereas in many of the other departments employees are paid

from a lump-sum appropriation, and their compensation may be fixed at almost any rate the head of the division or bureau or department desires. Consequently other employees of the Government want to be transferred to the bureau or division or department the employees of which are paid from a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am anxious to get along as rapidly as I can, and I will make this suggestion: So far as I am personally concerned, although I am not authorized to do so by the committee, I will make no objection to an amendment that will change "22" in class 4 to "18," "33" in class 3 to "25," and "100" in class 2 to "75."

Mr. SMOOT. Why not merely double the number of clerks provided for in the current law? I do not refer to the law which has passed to apply to the next fiscal year, but to the current law.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand what the Senator means, but there is one provision in the current law in this instance that should never apply to a well-organized office. There always ought to be more clerks in the lower class than in the higher, and as it stands now there are just the same number in the Patent Office in class 4 as there are in class 3. If we double the number in both cases the same condition will exist.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing to double the number of class 3 clerks and make it 18, which will be a 100 per cent increase.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. SMOOT. In the current law there are nine provided for. We gave them one extra. Now, it is proposed to double the nine.

Mr. NORRIS. We gave them one extra, which makes a total of 11.

Mr. SMOOT. There are only 9 in the current law, I will say to the Senator, and there was 1 extra given in the law for the next fiscal year, which makes 10.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator is wrong, but that is quite immaterial. The current law gives them 10, and the bill of which the Senator speaks gives them 11; but that is not material.

Mr. SMOOT. No; there is only a difference of one employee.

Mr. NORRIS. The point I am making is that we want this office to be properly organized, and in a properly organized office of this kind the number of clerks should decrease as the salary increases.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to make the number of fourth-class clerks and the third-class clerks the same. The Senator gets the point I am making, I think.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but to-day they are exactly the same.

Mr. NORRIS. I know they are, but I want to change that, and this law changes it; but, according to the Senator's proposition, if I doubled them in each case, it would still leave the proportions in the various classes the same. I have not the place in the bill. Let me see where it is.

Mr. SMOOT. We can agree upon the number, and then put them in at the proper place.

Mr. NORRIS. We can get the amendment through right now.

Mr. SMOOT. They are on page 3, line 7.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on page 3, line 7, I move to strike out "22," at the end of the line, and insert "18."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 3, line 7, at the end of the line, it is proposed to strike out "22" and in lieu thereof to insert "18," so that it will read "18 of class 4."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. And, on line 8, I move to strike out "33" and insert "25."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On line 8, it is proposed to strike out "33," before the words "of class 3," and in lieu thereof to insert "25."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On line 9, I move to strike out "100" and insert "75."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On line 9, it is proposed to strike out "100," before the words "of class 2," and in lieu thereof to insert "75."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, under current law there are only 17 of class 2. That number is increased from 17 to 100.

Mr. NORRIS. To 75.

Mr. SMOOT. But, I say, that is too much of an increase.

Mr. NORRIS. No; the Senator forgets now that in class 1, under the legislative act which we have been speaking of, there are 137, and under this bill we have only 125.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, there is a reduction of 12.

Mr. SMOOT. And there is an increase of the other of 83.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. It goes without saying, however, that we must have a large increase to do the work of this office; and if we put the number at 75—for instance, take the Pension Office, take the Indian Office, or almost any of those offices—

Mr. SMOOT. There is not any comparison as to the clerk hire in those offices.

Mr. NORRIS. I think so.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, not when you take into consideration the number of employees, and that is what we always have to take into consideration when we are grunting clerks. I do not want to cripple the Patent Office. I know the importance of it. I want to give them all the employees that are necessary to do the work and keep the work current; but because they think now that they can come in here and get what they want, I do not think they ought to be allowed to ask for whatever number they wish and put it through. I do not believe that is fair. All I want is to do the fair thing by the Patent Office, and I believe it is outrageous to increase the number of clerks from 17 to 100. I shall have no objection if the Senator will put it down say to 50—that is 300 per cent increase—and let it go to conference.

Mr. NORRIS. It is an increase from 17 to 75. All right; with the understanding that we will investigate it and see if we can do the work with that number, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On line 9, it is proposed to strike out "100," before the words "of class 2," and in lieu thereof to insert "50," so that it will read "50 of class 2."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, several of the other amendments, until we get over further, are printed, and the Secretary can state them from the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what disposition was made of the next item, "125 of class 1"?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I am perfectly willing to increase that by 10 if the Senator wishes.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think it ought to be increased, Mr. President.

Mr. KING. What is the present number?

Mr. NORRIS. One hundred and thirty-seven.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, that is including the bill that is on the way now. I only have current law.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator with respect to the item on lines 10 and 11, "100 at \$1,100 each"? What is the current law?

Mr. SMOOT. The current law provides for 91, and I think either one or two are added under the bill that we have just passed.

Mr. NORRIS. What page is that?

Mr. KING. Page 3, lines 10 and 11.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. KING. What number of clerks come under that class in the existing law?

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator mean how many of class 1 and how many of the other class?

Mr. KING. Yes. I do not know the class. It says "100 at \$1,100 each."

Mr. SMOOT. That is not class 1. Class 1 is \$1,200 each, and it says "at \$1,100," and we have got to leave that at \$1,100, because the statutory roll only provides for clerks of class 4 at \$1,800, clerks of class 3 at \$1,600, clerks of class 2 at \$1,400, and clerks of class 1 at \$1,200.

Mr. KING. I am familiar with that; but—

Mr. NORRIS. Right there—the Senator has called my attention to the matter—I desire to ask whether we agreed to an amendment on line 11?

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. One amendment on line 11 was agreed to, to strike out "\$1,800" at the end of the line and in lieu thereof to insert "\$1,600."

Mr. SMOOT. That is the item referring to draftsmen, not clerks.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. That is the only one.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will excuse me, I am referring to the words "100 at \$1,100 each," found in lines 10 and 11.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the current law provides for 91, and that number has been increased to 100. In the bill that is now on the way to the President it may be that that was increased by 2; and, if so, there are 93. I will say to the Senator that I have not the least objection to that

increase. I think that is all right, and I would not ask a decrease in that number; and I will say also to the Senator from Nebraska that I think the next item, where 40 copyists are provided for, ought to be increased, because in the Patent Office that is exactly the work that ought to be and must be kept current. To-day we have 120 copyists, and in this bill they have been reduced to 40. Now, that is not altogether right.

Mr. NORRIS. What page is that?

Mr. SMOOT. That is page 3, line 13—"40 copyists, at \$1,100 each."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I take the testimony for it. They do not want any more. They did not ask us to give them any more, and I assume that this is enough to do the work. I shall not object to an amendment if the Senator wants to offer it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will state why I offer it, and then I will let it go out if the Senator will take it into consideration. What they intend to do is to take those copyists that we are paying to-day as copyists and add them in the different grades as clerks. I want these increased so that if they decide upon the 50 clerks instead of 100 there will be a provision in the bill that is in conference so as to take care of the copyists.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator wants to increase the 40, I shall make no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I move that the word "forty" be stricken out, and that "seventy-five" be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The READING CLERK. On page 3, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "40," and in lieu thereof to insert "75."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. That will allow the Senator, when he gets into conference, to decide as to whether it shall be 40 or 75.

Mr. NORRIS. The amendments I have suggested are all except those that are printed and marked in the bill. I ask the Secretary to continue to state the amendments.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska just a question or two relative to this bill.

I notice, Mr. President, that on page 3, line 6, there is a provision for a translator of languages at \$2,400. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska what the duties of the translator of languages are?

Mr. NORRIS. I think the name indicates pretty well the duties of the position. They have a great many foreign patents. The Patent Office exchanges patents with foreign Governments. There is in this bill a provision in the way of an amendment giving them statutory authority to do that. They have been doing it, however, for a great many years; and anybody can see that it is quite necessary that we should furnish copies of patents to other Governments, and in exchange get copies of their patents.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is quite true. Now, I should like to know, if the Senator knows, what the present salary is, and what is the difference between the salary they are receiving to-day and that provided for in the bill?

Mr. NORRIS. I have it here, but it may take me just a little while to find it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator in just a minute. The present salary is \$1,800.

Mr. HENDERSON. One thousand eight hundred dollars?

Mr. SMOOT. That is the current law.

Mr. HENDERSON. I should also like to know if there are any other departments in the Government service employing translators of languages?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, the State Department have many, many of them.

Mr. HENDERSON. And the Agricultural Department, and other departments?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Now, I want to bring this fact to the attention of the Senate: We are here legislating for one class in one department, when we have translators of languages in a great many departments. The report of the Reclassification Commission on page 832, Title 44, Translating Service, covers the entire Government service in Washington. It seems to me that when we come to the reclassification of the salaries of the Federal employees, we should do it as systematically as possible, and take up all of the services, all of the classes, and handle the matter so that there will be no inequalities and no injustices done to any branch of the service.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator is right, and I said so a while ago, and discussed it, and gave the reasons I had as to why we should do this. We did it in the case of the Post Office Department, and I listened to the Senator last night—or perhaps it was this morning—when he discussed the very



point he is making as applied to the bill which was pending at that time, relating to the Post Office Department.

Mr. HENDERSON. It was last night.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator's remarks were very apt, it is true; but, as I said, I think we are confronted with an emergency in this particular place, and I called attention to what the Senator alluded to. We have put the Post Office Department in a condition where that increase is going into effect. We have passed the bill, and it is going to become a law. This bill will not go any further than a conference committee until next December; but when we do legislate, as we ought to, on the bill which carries out the report which the Senator has mentioned, of course if it changes what we put in the law now—and the Post Office Department, which is already reorganized, will be under this law—if we make that change, when we come to a general reorganization, which I hope we will reach without delay, then that reorganization will be followed, of course.

Mr. HENDERSON. But I just wanted to tell the Senator that the Joint Reclassification Commission was excluded from reclassifying the salaries of the postal employees, as well as the employees of the navy yard. The bill creating our commission did not permit us to reclassify those salaries. That is why the other commission was appointed to reclassify the salaries of the postal employees, and a report was recently filed on that matter. Our work related solely to the Federal employees of the District of Columbia, exclusive of the Postal Service and navy yard.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not the Senator think it ought to include the post-office employees? Why should it not include them?

Mr. HENDERSON. There was another commission to do that work. I suppose that is the reason.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that, but why should not the post-office employees be equalized with those of other departments, the same as was done with other branches or bureaus or departments?

Mr. HENDERSON. The work of the commission was for the purpose of reclassifying the salaries of the Postal Service. I will call the Senator's attention to the fact that that service covers not only the District but the entire country, while our work was confined to the District of Columbia.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me ask the Senator, if he has it there, what salary the Commission on Reclassification gave to translators?

Mr. HENDERSON. We have, of course, grouped the different classes, provided for their duties, their qualifications, and their line of promotion. For instance, take translator A. That is the first head. The salaries we recommend run from \$1,320 to \$1,500. Then we have junior translator, senior translator, and principal translator.

Mr. NORRIS. What does the principal translator get?

Mr. HENDERSON. For principal translators the first year salaries are \$2,400. Then it goes in steps from \$2,400. The first step is to \$2,520, then to \$2,640, then to \$2,760.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the maximum?

Mr. HENDERSON. That is the maximum; \$2,760.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. After \$2,200 was tentatively agreed upon for translator of languages in the Patent Office, I took occasion to look at the appropriations which were made for translators in the other departments. In fact, when this bill was first printed, I had a number of translators of the State Department call on me, and a lady who I know is one of the very best translators in that department said, "If this bill becomes a law I want you to get me a transfer to the Patent Office just as quickly as you can. I have been a translator in the State Department, and I was promised \$1,800 per annum for that work. I have been receiving only \$1,600"; of course, with the bonus which she got. Every translator in the Government who is receiving fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, or eighteen hundred dollars will wonder how it is that for the same work translators in the Patent Office receive compensation amounting to \$400 more than the other departments are paying. But I am not going to question that at this time. I only wanted to say that after that was tentatively agreed upon at \$2,200, I looked it up, and I found that salaries in the other departments are very much lower than those in this office.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I want to inquire of the Senator from Nebraska, directing his attention to page 2, line 16, as to 47 principals at \$3,900 each. The current law provides for how many, if the Senator will inform me?

Mr. SMOOT. Forty-five.

Mr. NORRIS. Principal examiners?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. The law for the current year provides for 43; the appropriation act for the next fiscal year provides for 45; and this bill for 47.

Mr. KING. A bill was recently passed increasing the number of employees in the Patent Office. Was not that increase along all or most of the lines in the office, and was it not passed because of the congested condition and for the purpose of meeting the claimed needs of the service?

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, that was done by the Appropriations Committee, and I am not on that committee. There were some increases made in the appropriation bill. But they did not undertake, as I understand it, to go into the reorganization which the Committee on Patents did; they only touched it, in fact. Those increases were very slight.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I confess that I look with some misgivings upon a bill which is presented for our consideration which shows such enormous increases in the personnel of any department. And it will be remembered that we increased the employees within the District of Columbia during the war nearly, if not quite, 100,000. Prior to the war there were about 32,000 employees of the Government in the District of Columbia. There has been no adequate reduction since then, and it seems impossible to secure any. Notwithstanding efforts made by Senators and Representatives to effectuate reforms and reductions, it has been impossible to get the bureaus and the heads of departments to consent to any substantial reduction. So now, nearly two years after peace, there are in Washington more than a hundred thousand employees as against 32,000 before the war. It seems to me that the Republican Party, charged as it is with the legislative work of the Government, ought to seek economy and ought to so legislate as to compel a reduction in the number of Federal employees. The number is too great, and everyone familiar with the situation knows it. I have had hundreds of employees of the Government communicate with me and complain about the superabundance of clerks and other employees in the District.

There are thousands of officials here of the highest character. They desire efficient service and rebel against the retention of inefficient and unnecessary employees. We should order a dismissal of unnecessary employees and increase the compensation of the efficient and faithful ones.

Promotions should be made based on efficiency and every encouragement should be offered to those who wholeheartedly and sincerely serve the Government.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, in a general way I agree with what he says about the reduction in the number of employees; but the Patent Office is really a business institution. Its activities have been continually increasing, and they will continue to increase. The war has resulted in giving a permanent increase to the business, in my judgment, in the Patent Office along certain lines, in chemistry and other sciences, so it is not like a bureau which was built up in a night, as was the War Risk Insurance Bureau and the other bureaus which it became necessary to create during the war. It is really a business institution, doing a very large business, which is increasing all the time.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I can not quite understand how the Patent Office has been able to function and to do good work with the number of employees which it has had in the past if it is essential, for it to perform its work, that it must now have this enormous increase in the number of employees. As I have hastily glanced at the bill—I do not have before me the current law—it seems to me there must be an increase in the number of employees of nearly or quite 100 per cent. It appears to me that an increase of 10 to 25 per cent is all that should be required. I can not understand the necessity for this very great increase. The Senator from Nebraska knows that if Congress should listen to the appeals of the heads of executive departments there never would be any decrease in the number of employees. When we have added to some of these departments, or at least have permitted them to add large numbers of employees, the demand has usually been for still more.

I ask the Senator again if he regards it as necessary that there should be this enormous increase, and whether the Secretary of the Interior, not in a perfunctory way, but upon examination, has approved these demands, and whether the Secretary of the Treasury, who is charged under the law with the duty of submitting proper estimates to Congress bearing upon the question of employees, costs of departments, and so forth, approves of this great increase in the personnel of the Patent Office. I venture the assertion, receiving no response, that there has been no approval by the heads of these departments of this great increase.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] has just called attention to the fact that the Reclassification Commission ap-

pointed by Congress considered the personnel of the Patent Office and classified the employees therein. This commission also recommended the compensation to be paid the employees therein. They constitute a part of the 1,700 classes of employees into which the great army of employees has been divided in the report which has been submitted for our consideration. Notwithstanding the report is before us, and the bill recommended carrying this report into effect is before us, we take up in a piecemeal fashion particular branches of the Government, dealt with by this commission, and seek to change the compensation in those branches from existing law, and of course to change the compensation from the recommendations prescribed by the commission.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that if we take up in this fashion the Patent Office we shall be called upon to take up some other branches, and if we establish rates of compensation for the employees of the Patent Office at a different time from the consideration of this general bill, we are bound to make some changes in existing law, and when we consider other departments, the changes which we have made will be brought to our attention, and we will be asked to conform our legislation to such changes. The result will be that we will be proceeding in a sort of stepladder style with our legislation. There will be no uniformity, there will be no stability, there will be no security, and we will spend our time here from session to session adjusting and readjusting and adjusting again to meet the changing conditions which have resulted from this piecemeal method of dealing with the subject.

I think it is a mistake, notwithstanding this exigent condition to which the Senator refers, to proceed in this manner. I think it would be far wiser if we would take up a general bill and deal with the subject in a scientific, systematic, broad, and comprehensive manner. However, I have helped the Senator bring this bill to the attention of the Senate, because of the claims made that the service in the office was breaking down, and I was willing to join in avoiding a catastrophe if one threatened the service. But I am afraid that the need is not as great as has been represented by some interested parties, and that the Patent Office will continue to function in a fair way without this bill. I shall vote for the bill, with some amendments, because I shall rely upon the conference committee dealing in a just manner with the questions presented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 7, beginning with line 20, to strike out the rest of that page, all of page 8, and through line 18, on page 9, as follows:

SEC. 7. That section 4921 of the Revised Statutes be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4921. The several courts vested with jurisdiction of cases arising under the patent laws shall have power to grant injunctions according to the course and principles of courts of equity, to prevent the violation of any right secured by patent, on such terms as the court may deem reasonable; and upon a decree being rendered in any such case for an infringement the complainant shall be entitled to recover, in addition to the profits to be accounted for by the defendant, the damages the complainant has sustained thereby, and the court shall assess the same or cause the same to be assessed under its direction. If on the proofs it shall appear that the complainant has suffered damage from the infringement or that the defendant has realized profits therefrom to which the complainant is justly entitled, but that such damages and profits are not susceptible of exact calculation and determination, the court may, on evidence tending to establish the same, in its discretion, receive opinion or expert testimony, which is hereby declared to be competent and admissible, subject to the general rules of evidence applicable to this character of testimony; and upon such evidence and all other evidence in the record the court may adjudge and decree the payment by the defendant to the complainant of a reasonable sum as a royalty or general damages for the infringement. And the court shall have the same power to increase such damages, in its discretion, as is given to increase the damages found by verdicts in actions in the nature of actions of trespass upon the case; but in any suit or action brought for the infringement of any patent there shall be no recovery of profits or damages for any infringement committed more than six years before the filing of the bill of complaint or the issuing of the writ in such suit or action, and this provision shall apply to existing causes of action. And it shall be the duty of the clerks of such courts within one month after the filing of any action, suit, or proceeding arising under the patent laws to give notice thereof in writing to the Commissioner of Patents, setting forth in order so far as known the names and addresses of the litigants, names of the inventors, and the designating number or numbers of the patent or patents upon which the action, suit, or proceeding has been brought, and it shall be the duty of the Commissioner of Patents on receipt of such notice forthwith to indorse the same upon the file wrapper of the said patent or patents and to incorporate the same as a part of the contents of said file or file wrapper; and for each notice required to be furnished to the Commissioner of Patents in compliance herewith a fee of 50 cents shall be taxed by the clerk as costs of suit."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. The next amendment is, on page 9, line 19, to renumber the section, striking out "8" and inserting "7."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On page 10, after line 10, I move to insert the following:

For uncertified printed copies of specifications and drawings of patents, 10 cents per copy: *Provided*, That the Commissioner of Patents may supply public libraries with such copies as published for \$50 per annum: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Patents may exchange copies of United States patents for those of foreign countries.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether or not there has been any prolongation of the period of time for which a patent would be in effect?

Mr. NORRIS. There has not.

Mr. KING. There has been no change in existing law with reference to what a patent does, the rights which it grants, and the protections and benefits accruing therefrom?

Mr. NORRIS. The only change, in my judgment, that might apply to the question which the Senator has asked is the one amendment that we have agreed to, which struck out section 7 in the bill, but reenacted section 4921 of the Revised Statutes.

The committee thought, after very interesting and rather exhaustive debate between some of the ablest patent lawyers in the United States on that subject, that we had better not change that law, and we struck out the section. With that exception, there is nothing in the bill that I recall that changes the time of patents, and the only new thing in the amendment that is pending is this language:

For uncertified printed copies of specifications and drawings of patents, 10 cents per copy.

I think that is the existing law now, or it is in a bill that will become a law, but the proviso is new:

*Provided*, That the Commissioner of Patents may supply public libraries with such copies as published, for \$50 per annum: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Patents may exchange copies of United States patents for those of foreign countries.

He is doing that now and has been doing it for several years; but the commissioner himself stated that, as a matter of fact, he thought he had been doing it without authority, that there was no law authorizing it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am compelled to attend a committee meeting in a moment. There are two amendments which I desire to ask unanimous consent to have considered at this time. I am quite sure the Senator will not object.

Mr. NORRIS. I will not object, but let me inquire of the chair if the amendment on page 10 has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet.

Mr. NORRIS. There is no objection to that amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. What amendment does the Senator from Utah wish to take up?

Mr. SMOOT. On page 11, lines 24 and 25, and on page 12, line 1.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the next amendment, I will say to the Senator, with the exception of one. Let us dispose of the other one first. I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. The next amendment is, on page 11, line 17, after the numerals "1920," to strike out the comma and the words—

with reference to the fee for issuing an original patent, and shall apply only to patents issued on applications filed after that date. The fees for issuing original patents on all other applications shall be as now provided by law.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to strike out all of section 9. Section 10 provides that certain enactments shall go into effect July 1, and we know this bill can not become a law at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 11 strike out lines 16 to 21, both inclusive.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, the amendment to which the Senator from Utah desires to call attention is designated as section 10 but ought to be section 9. I ask that that change be made and the section inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. Insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 9. That the Federal Trade Commission be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered to accept assignment of, or license or other rights or powers under, to develop, to issue or refuse to issue licenses under, to encourage the industrial use and application of, and otherwise to administer, on behalf of the United States, under such regulations and in such manner as the President shall prescribe, inventions, patents, and patent rights which said commission deems it to the advantage of the public to be so accepted, as these may from time to time be tendered it by employees of the various departments or other establishments of the Government, or by other individuals or agencies; and to cooperate, as necessity may arise, with scientific or other agencies of the Government in the discharge of the duties herein set out, and



the Federal Trade Commission is hereby authorized and empowered to collect fees and royalties for licensing said inventions, patents, and patent rights in such amounts and in such manner as the President shall direct, and shall deposit the same with the Treasurer of the United States; and of the total amount of such fees and royalties so deposited a certain per cent, to be determined by the President, shall be reserved, set aside, and appropriated as a special fund to be disbursed as directed by the President to remunerate inventors for such of their inventions, patents, and patent rights contemplated by this section as may prove meritorious and of public benefit.

The Commissioner of Patents is hereby directed to grant all patents and record all assignment and licenses contemplated by this section without the payment of any fee.

Mr. NORRIS. With reference to this amendment the committee moves to amend the amendment by striking out on page 11 all of lines 24 and 25 and on page 12 all of line 1 to and including the word "administer," leaving only the word "on" in that line. That is the amendment the Senator from Utah means?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 11, lines 24 and 25, and on page 12, line 1, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out the words "or license or other rights or powers under, to develop, to issue or refuse to issue licenses under, to encourage the industrial use and application of, and otherwise to administer."

Mr. KING. So that it will read—

The READING CLERK. So that it will read:

That the Federal Trade Commission be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered to accept assignment of, on behalf of the United States, under such regulations and in such manner as the President shall prescribe, inventions, patents, and patent rights which said commission deems it to the advantage of the public to be so accepted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think, in order to harmonize the rest of the section with the three lines excluded, the Senator will find it necessary to strike out everything after the word "out" in line 10, page 12. Everything in section 10 after the word "out" in line 10, page 12, refers to fees and royalties for licensing inventions, and so forth. With the excision of lines 24 and 25, page 11, and line 1 on page 12, everything after the word "out" in line 10, on page 12, must be excluded.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator would destroy its usefulness entirely.

Mr. THOMAS. Then the Senator ought to reinsert the three lines he has moved to strike out. I will read the language, beginning on line 10:

The Federal Trade Commission is hereby authorized and empowered to collect fees and royalties for licensing said inventions, patents, and patent rights, in such amounts and in such manner as the President shall direct, and shall deposit the same with the Treasurer of the United States—

That is, the fees and royalties.

I skip to line 22, which reads:

The Commissioner of Patents is hereby directed to grant all patents and record all assignments and licenses contemplated by this section without the payment of any fee.

If it is the Senator's purpose to deprive the Federal Trade Commission of the power to license, then, of course, all I have read should be eliminated.

Mr. NORRIS. My idea was that when we took out the language which the amendment to the amendment strikes out it would leave the power of the Federal Trade Commission to accept an assignment of an invention, a patent, or a patent right.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, farther on down, the Federal Trade Commission is given this power—

to collect fees and royalties for licensing said inventions, patents, etc.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator deprives it in his first amendment of the power to license.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not think so. There has always been some doubt in my mind as to what that line really meant. Of course, I am proposing to strike it out to meet objections to it. The amendment is not made because I want to make it.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that; but the section is meaningless if that be stricken out and the remainder to which I have called attention is left in.

Mr. NORRIS. I can not understand that. We give them power, in the first place, to accept an assignment.

Mr. THOMAS. That is perfectly all right.

Mr. NORRIS. Then we authorize them to license a corporation or individual to manufacture it and sell it.

Mr. THOMAS. But you strike that out.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; that is not stricken out. Does it not follow from the language, "and the Federal Trade Commission is hereby authorized and empowered to collect fees and royalties

for licensing said inventions," that they would have authority to license?

Mr. THOMAS. I think if the Senator strikes out the three lines the power to license is gone, but I will not argue it now, because the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] wishes to fill an engagement with a committee, and I will yield to him.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator if in the line following the provision—

Mr. NORRIS. First let me say that the amendment to the amendment has not been agreed to. If there be no objection, let us agree to it. If the amendment is agreed to, I will offer the other amendment next.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not object to the Senator's amendment as he has offered it.

Mr. NORRIS. Then let us have a vote on the amendment offered to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator wanted to perfect the amendment first. On line 7, page 12, after the word "Government," I move to strike out the words "or by other individuals or agencies."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. In the committee amendment, page 12, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "or by other individuals or agencies."

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator accept that amendment to the amendment?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I can not accept it. I would very much dislike to see the Senate agree to that amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I have a committee meeting that I must attend, but I wish to say to the Senator that by striking out those words it simply means that any invention, if it is made by any Government employee, can be transferred to the Federal Trade Commission. If we are going to allow other individuals and agencies to transfer to the Federal Trade Commission it will not be very long before the Federal Trade Commission is receiving and accepting these inventions and issuing licenses to everyone who undertakes to manufacture a patented article. I think there will be more harm than there could possibly be good come from it. That is my opinion.

Where the Government of the United States has employees working in any particular department, we will say the Navy Department or the War Department, where they are called by the Government to make all of the investigations asked for by any citizen of the United States, and upon these requests secure an idea that leads to a patented article or leads to some discovery on their part, it does seem to me that the Government of the United States ought to have some agency whereby they can accept that invention and grant licenses to anyone as provided for in the bill and collect royalties. That is well and good; but that is not what this language means. The words "or by other individuals or agencies" mean any individual or any agency in the United States. I think the result will be that the inventive genius of the country, the men who have studied all their lives and brought out the most remarkable inventions for public use and made the country renowned all over the world for its wonderful inventions, will be interfered with if the section becomes operative with those words in it. I can not see any objection to the words going out and to the other amendment that will prevent the Government of the United States from operating and going into the manufacture of any articles that may be made under patents issued by the Federal Trade Commission. I hoped that the Senator would accept the amendment. All I can say is that I hope we can have a vote on it, anyhow, if the Senator will allow the vote to be taken now.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to answer the Senator's argument, and then I will be ready to take a vote. I do not think the Senator ought to take up the time in making an argument in favor of his amendment and then ask to have a vote before the other side can be heard.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, I do not want to do that.

Mr. NORRIS. I am sorry the Senator can not remain.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want the Senator to feel that I sought to make an argument and then asked that he should be cut off. I asked for a vote simply because I am compelled to leave the Chamber at this time. There is a committee waiting for me at this moment, and I must go.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I, of course, am aware that the amendment designated as section 10 embodies in the bill the provisions of a bill that had previously passed the Senate and has therefore the approval of a majority of this body.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] has given this bill very long and patient consideration and he has consequently informed himself on this subject much more minutely and completely than I have had time to do. It may be, therefore,

that the Senator can give to the Senate the best of reasons for incorporating this section into the proposed law, but from the little study I have been able to give it I regard it as highly objectionable legislation. It provides "that the Federal Trade Commission be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered to accept assignment" on behalf of the United States of patents, and so forth. Under these provisions the Federal Trade Commission, a body which was created for the purpose of discharging certain defined functions and duties, designed to prevent unfair competition in the industries of the United States, will be clothed with additional authority, to become the custodian of all such patents as may be assigned to it by the employees of the Government or by other individuals or agencies; and it is to administer those patents by a system of licenses or permits.

I may be mistaken, but my opinion is that under the operation of this proposed law the Federal Trade Commission will be transformed from a semijudicial body into an administrative bureau, and its time will be practically monopolized by its administration of a new patent system of which the Government is to be the owner.

The number of patents in the United States is at present enormous. That number increases, I am told, from year to year, evidencing the enterprise and inventive genius of the American people, and necessitating, in my judgment, the increase which this bill seems to require in the force under the Commissioner of Patents.

When this bill becomes a law, all patents and applications for patents which have been designed or discovered by employees of the Government can be assigned to the Federal Trade Commission on behalf of the United States, whereupon the patent becomes the property of the United States. What the employee can do any other patentee in the United States can do. Every man who takes out a patent believes, or else he would not go to the trouble, that he has invented something useful, something needful, something that will add to the sum total of human comfort or progress and which therefore should be utilized and utilized as soon as possible; yet experience tells us that, perhaps, one out of 400 or 500 patents is the proportion between the patents which are really practicable and useful and those which prove inoperative or ineffective.

The man, however, whose patent is not accepted by the public is discontented; he is unhappy; he believes that the merits of the invention are being ignored; possibly it is subject to obstruction; that, whatever the reason, it has not had a fair chance. Under this bill, therefore, he will rush to the Federal Trade Commission, representing the Government, to make an assignment of his patent and then insist upon the issuance of licenses, doubtless encouraging men to apply for such licenses, since the bill provides that he shall have a proportion, to be fixed by rules and regulations, of the income derived by the Government under the patent system. I imagine that that will keep the Federal Trade Commission pretty busy; I imagine that if it attends to this administrative duty which we are about to saddle upon it it will have little time to devote to the purposes for which it was originally created.

Some contend that the Federal Trade Commission is a very valuable body; others deny that it functions at all; but, whatever the fact may be, we can not escape the conclusion that the Federal Trade Commission was established as and has become a distinctive branch of administrative service to encounter and to overcome existing industrial abuses which are the result of unfair competition. By saddling this additional burden upon it we justify the contention, if the contention should be made in the future, that it is unable to function in the direction of preventing unfair competition because of the fact that its so-called patent duties monopolize all of its time and attention. I do not believe, Mr. President, that that is wise legislative policy.

If we create such a commission as a Federal Trade Commission or as a Tariff Commission by a law specifically defining its duties and its objects, we should insist that it shall perform those duties and purposes only; in any event, we should not by our own action even tend to make their performance of those obligations difficult, if not impossible.

That was one objection which I had to the so-called dye-stuffs bill, that it converted the Tariff Commission into an administrative bureau, and the section of the bill to which I am now referring will do precisely that thing to the Federal Trade Commission. I do not think it should be done. Of course, if the legislation is desirable, it will be very easy by amendment to select some other body as the custodian of these patents, and clothe it with the authority to act as it is proposed here to clothe the Trade Commission with authority to act.

The Trade Commission, presumably, was selected because during the war, and perhaps since the war, it has had much to do with the German dye patents which were taken over by the

Government; but that was one of the incidents of the struggle; that was a temporary affair. Here is a permanent arrangement, an arrangement which if crystallized into statute brings upon the Trade Commission an official authority that must constantly expand. Every patent assigned or taken over by it will to that extent add to the burden of its duties; and while we may contend that an efficient clerical service can be supplied by statute to enable it to perform the added duties, the fact remains that the commission itself is the body to be held responsible to the people under the law for the efficient discharge of the functions and the obligations sought to be imposed by this section.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is wise for the Government of the United States to go into the patent-rights business, and that is the fundamental objection which I entertain to this entire section.

I differ somewhat from my friend the Senator from Utah. I think that if an employee of the Government is sufficiently alive to his self-interest to take advantage of opportunities that come to him in whatever capacity and by the use of those opportunities develops an invention which is practical and valuable it should belong to him. I think it is proper, as the law now provides, that the Government should itself have the use of that invention free; but, so far as the public is concerned, that man is entitled to the fruit of his genius, subject to that limitation, to the same extent as though he had made the discovery as a private citizen.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I do not quite agree with the attitude of the Senator, if I understand the situation correctly. If he will pardon me, let me ascertain if I do draw the right conclusion. As I understand, there are a large number of experts working in the Patent Office—men of ability, men who are familiar with patents. The various inventions which are perfected throughout the country are presented to the Patent Office; those men have the opportunity to see them and examine them; they are in a fortunate position for the purpose of ascertaining what the inventions are; they are being paid a fair salary by the Government. Does the Senator think that they ought to take advantage of the information which they receive while they are in the employ of the Government, acting in a sort of a fiduciary capacity, and, profiting by the inventions which are made by others, make some other discovery or invention based upon the work or combination of work of a large number of men, perfect an invention and then profit by it?

Mr. THOMAS. So long as the Government has the benefit of the invention, I say, certainly; I do not object to that at all, though a great many do; but if there is such an employee in the expert service of the Patent Office sufficiently alive to the situation, and who honestly and without infringing upon the patent or pirating the patent which he is examining or the application for a patent which he is examining, discovers some principle that is useful and patentable, I say, yes, let him have it. I think the law as it now stands excepts that class of employees, however, from the operation of the statute; I am pretty sure that it does, but I am giving my abstract opinion.

It might be perfectly well, as a practical proposition, to require these assignments to be made to the Commissioner of Patents and let him deal with them, if we are to go into this business at all.

It would be far better for the Commissioner of Patents to handle them, in my judgment, than it would be to burden the trade commission or any other of these existing commissions with them. But fundamentally to me it is unwise to saddle thousands of patent rights upon the Government of the United States for which, as owners thereof, it is required to issue licenses or permits to those who desire to take advantage of them. It is a species of private business. We have gotten along pretty well up to this time without such an arrangement. The Government is a century and a quarter old or more. During all this period the inventive faculties of America have had full sway for development. The fruits of investigation and of discovery properly guaranteed to the fortunate individual who may have been able to secure some mechanical contrivance, bring practical advantage to the public and fortune to him. This would seem to me to be designed to help over the fellow whose invention will not help itself over, or whose position in life perhaps may make it difficult for him to overcome the rudimentary or preliminary obstacles presenting themselves to the ultimate determination of the value of the thing which he has discovered.

So I believe that it is a bad policy for the country to embark upon. It will be followed in all probability by a similar provision regarding copyrights, and possibly patented formulae for medicines designed to cure the rheumatism, make the hair grow,



or in some other way administer to the evils that affect the human system. It is but one step that we are taking, and I can see no difference between encouraging a man who patents a machine that will do something and encouraging a man who writes a book that will do something, or discovers some medical formula that will result in benefit to mankind. Once we embark upon the policy of governmental ownership of the things which are the fruit of the human mind, and upon the theory that if this fruit comes from the mind of the employee he is entitled to some special consideration, then very naturally the outsider will demand, as he has here demanded, that he be considered also; and the bars being let down and the gates thrown open the entering flood is inevitable.

Mr. President, I fully agree also with the view expressed by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR], who moved to strike out the words "or by other individuals or agencies." Under the objectionable clause every man, woman, and child, every partnership, corporation, or association in the United States or its dependencies, is given the privilege of assigning any patent for any invention to the Government, or to the Trade Commission for the Government, whereupon it becomes Government property, to be administered for the joint benefit of the United States and the patentee. I may be obtuse, but the objection to such a provision in a patent law seems to me self-evident. I can imagine its effect within the next 10 years in the added encouragement that it gives to the inventor—and about 50 per cent of the American people regard themselves as inventors—to the overwhelming development of the so-called patent system, and to the intrusion upon the Government of every conceivable device that genius or lunacy, or both, can produce within that period of time.

Some one has said that there is but a short step between genius and insanity, and there is a great deal in it; but everybody knows that the average patentee is a crank. The average patentee is a man thoroughly believing in himself—of which I do not complain—absolutely possessed by the conviction that his is the one invention that will redeem mankind from poverty and from inconvenience, and he certainly will take advantage of a law of this sort to impress himself and his invention upon the Government; and even though he may not make a practical success of his effort, think of the extent to which he enlarges the public business uselessly, but expensively!

There may be good reasons for encouraging the employee of the Government who makes an invention. There can be no good reason outside of the patent law itself—and that gives encouragement enough—for encouraging the outsider or for holding out to him the promise of a Government partnership—for that is what this virtually means—should he see fit to assign to the Government what he possesses.

I hope this section will be stricken out. The Senator having charge of the bill told me this morning that he would offer a very salutary proviso, which has not yet been reached, which would prohibit the Government from developing any patent scheme on its own account; which would prevent it, in other words, from going into business and using its patent rights, or any of them, as the basis. That is extremely desirable.

The Senator has offered an amendment, which has been accepted, eliminating from the section the last two lines on page 11, and all of the first line upon page 12 except the last word, which I will read:

or license or other rights or powers under, to develop, to issue or refuse to issue licenses under, to encourage the industrial use and application of, and otherwise to administer.

In consequence of which the Trade Commission is limited to the acceptance of assignments only of such patents and patent rights as may be offered to it. It will be noticed that the right to accept a license, and the right to issue or refuse to issue licenses thereunder, is now eliminated from the section; yet in other parts of the section as it now stands the Trade Commission is "authorized and empowered to collect fees and royalties for licensing said inventions, patents, and patent rights in such amounts and in such manner as the President shall direct," and so forth. There seems to be some difference between the Senator having charge of the bill and myself regarding the relation between the three lines which have been eliminated from the section and that part of the section to which I refer. I do not believe the elimination of the three lines, without the further elimination of other parts of the section, does anything more than to make the section unworkable, because confusing.

That the Federal Trade Commission be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered to accept assignment of, or license or other rights or powers under, to develop, to issue or refuse to issue licenses under—

And so forth. Now, if the power to issue or to refuse to issue licenses under any patent that may be assigned to the Govern-

ment under this bill is wanting, how can provision be made for the disposition of the moneys to be received from such a license? In other words, if a man can not license he can not collect any fees for licensing; and the part of the section which is designed to make disposition of these license fees should be eliminated also, because it relates back to nothing that is substantial in the bill, the amendment having been accepted.

Mr. President, I do not care to say any more at this time. I think it is fair to the Senator having charge of the bill to say that after the amendment is perfected I shall ask to have it stricken from the bill.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 3244. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to R. L. Credille, mayor of the village of Bonita, La., in trust, for certain purposes; and

S. 3852. An act for the relief of the Garden City (Kans.) Water Users' Association, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13266) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13229) to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the women's bureau.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes, insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill, asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, Mr. EDMONDS, Mr. ROWE, Mr. HARDY, and Mr. BANKHEAD managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the concurrent resolution of the Senate numbered 26, authorizing the Speaker of the House to cancel his signature to the enrolled bills (S. 1005) for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Matoa* and (S. 1222) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett*, and authorizing the enrollment of the bills each with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 547. An act authorizing the enlistment of non-English-speaking citizens and aliens;

S. 1726. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 2789. An act for the consolidation of forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes;

S. 3566. An act to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States," approved February 5, 1917;

S. 4212. An act to authorize the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey to construct a bridge across the waters of the Delaware River, between the city of Easton, in the State of Pennsylvania, and the city of Phillipsburg, in the State of New Jersey;

S. 4286. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$75,000 for the purpose of constructing and installing a municipal electric light and power plant and for the construction of a public-school building," approved September 29, 1919;

S. 4402. An act authorizing Troup County, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Chattahoochee River near West Point, Ga.;

S. 4427. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Columbus, in the State of Georgia, to construct a bridge across the Chattahoochee River;

H. R. 2. An act to pension soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition;

H. R. 13229. An act to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the women's bureau;

H. R. 13313. An act to authorize the construction of flood control and improvement works in Boise de Sioux River, the Red River of the North, and Lake Traverse, between the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota;

H. R. 13329. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer certain surplus material, machinery, and equipment to the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of a commission to confer with the Dominion Government or the provincial governments of Quebec, Ontario, and New Brunswick as to certain restrictive orders in council of the said Provinces relative to the exportation of pulp wood therefrom to the United States.

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine; to repeal certain emergency legislation; and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes, and insisting upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill and requesting a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments, agree to the further conference asked for by the House, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. CALDER, Mr. McNARY, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. RANSDELL conferees at the further conference on the part of the Senate.

#### NATIONAL EXPENDITURES.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, practically all the supply bills have been enacted into law or are in conference. I think it is incumbent upon me to show, if I can, that the Republican Party, which promised economy and reduction of expenses and the lowering of taxes, has done neither.

I have taken account of all the appropriation bills passed at this session, and I think it is fair to compare these bills with the appropriation bills passed under the Democratic administration in 1916. I have taken up each appropriation bill passed in 1916, before the war. Since the war has been over now for about two years—it is about that length of time since the armistice—and we are in peace, I say, I think it fair and just to compare the appropriation bills for 1916 with the appropriation bills passed during this session.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in that comparison does the Senator show the sums that we have been compelled to appropriate for the expenses that were incurred during the war?

Mr. OVERMAN. The hang-over expenses?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. They amount to billions of dollars.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am going to show those. Of course, the Army has been demobilized, and we do not have to pay the Army and meet the other war expenses. There is no appropriation for that.

Mr. SMOOT. I mean, Mr. President, the contracts which are still unsettled. They amount to billions of dollars.

Mr. OVERMAN. We have appropriated billions of dollars during this Congress. I am taking up the leading appropriation bills for the fiscal concerns of the Government without regard to the war. I have tried to eliminate war activities and those expenses which have grown out of the war.

Take the sundry civil bill. Mr. President, that bill this year carries \$400,000,000, as against \$125,000,000 in 1916. The reason for that is that it includes appropriations for the hospitals, which were necessary, and the War Risk Bureau. I have tried to be fair by eliminating those things, showing still that the sundry civil bill is more than it was in 1916.

Mr. President, in 1916 the Agricultural appropriation bill carried \$22,000,000, and this year it carried \$31,000,000, or an increase of \$8,743,000.

The Army appropriation bill amounted to \$101,974,000, as against \$376,765,000 in 1916. But, in addition to that, we have the reorganization bill, which makes it over \$600,000,000.

The Diplomatic and Consular bill in 1916 amounted to \$4,061,280, and in 1921 it is \$9,000,000, or an increase of \$5,200,000.

The District of Columbia bill in 1916, under the Democratic administration, amounted to \$11,859,000, and this year it is \$18,305,000, or \$6,000,000 more.

The fortifications bill in 1916 was \$6,060,000. This year it is \$18,000,000, or \$12,000,000 more than it was two years before the war.

The Indian appropriation bill was \$9,771,902.76 in 1916. This year it is \$12,788,397, or an increase of over \$3,000,000.

The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill carried \$36,000,000. This year it carries \$104,000,000, or an increase of \$67,000,000.

The Military Academy bill carried \$1,000,000, in round numbers; for 1921 it is \$2,000,000, or \$1,072,000 more than it was in 1916.

The naval appropriation bill in 1916 was \$149,661,000. This year it is \$433,000,000.

The pension bill was \$164,000,000 in 1916. This year it is \$279,000,000, or an increase of \$114,000,000.

The Post Office appropriation bill in 1916 carried \$313,364,067. In 1921 it is \$462,574,000, or an increase of \$149,000,000.

The only decrease is in the river and harbor bill, which is not signed. In 1916 it was \$30,000,000; in 1921 it is \$12,000,000.

The sundry civil bill in 1916 was \$126,922,000. This year it is \$428,216,000, or an increase of \$300,000,000.

That makes a grand total, Mr. President, for all appropriations in 13 great appropriation bills for 1916 of \$978,722,857, and under this economic administration in 1921 these 13 supply bills carry \$2,189,960,000, or an increase in these 13 bills over the appropriation bills of 1916 of \$1,211,240,000.

Thus it will be noted that there was appropriated for pensions for military service rendered prior to the World War the sum of \$279,000,000 for 1921, as compared with \$164,100,000 for 1916; for the Postal Service, \$462,574,546 for 1921, as compared with \$313,364,067 for 1916; for the Indian Service, \$12,788,397 for 1921, as compared with \$9,771,902.75 for 1916; for Agriculture, \$31,714,368 for 1921, as compared with \$22,971,782 for 1916; for the Diplomatic and Consular Service, \$9,253,537.91 for 1921, as compared with \$4,061,280.01 for 1916; for fortifications, \$18,833,442 for 1921, as compared with \$6,060,216.90 for 1916; for the Military Academy, \$2,142,212.70 for 1921, as compared with \$1,069,813.37 for 1916; and for District of Columbia, \$18,305,484.87 for 1921, as compared with \$11,859,584.45 for 1916; an increase of \$320,097,936.12 for 1921 over the amount appropriated in 1916 in these nine regular appropriation bills. And let me say again, that it can not be claimed that these increases have been brought about as the result of activities growing out of the war, or "war hangovers." And this does not take into consideration the increased drafts on the Treasury made by special acts passed at this and the extra session.

I make an exception of this great bill, known as the sundry civil bill, in which there was such a great increase because of the hospitals and the War Risk Bureau.

If you deduct from the appropriation in the sundry civil bill for 1921 the amounts carried for compensation, for hospital treatment, the training of soldiers, and other services growing out of the war, it will be found that it carried \$145,000,000, as compared with \$126,000,000 carried in 1916 for the same purposes. Thus, excepting the War Risk Bureau and the hospitals and all the war activities provided in that great bill, you still have an increase of \$20,000,000.

Also laws have been passed increasing the pension of those who were in the military service prior to the late war. These laws will add at least \$77,500,000 to the present pension appropriation, and as a result there has been appropriated for the next fiscal year the sum of \$279,000,000, which is nearly \$56,000,000 more than has ever been paid in any one year, and \$123,564,708.97 more than was paid eight years ago.

Mr. President, there is another thing which we have not taken into consideration in these great appropriation bills. As the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] knows, the appropriations for unexpended balances are hard to ascertain. We have an appropriation before us, and without naming any amount in the appropriation bill at all we appropriate the unexpended balance, which is a bad system. That money ought to go back into the Treasury. We ought not to appropriate unexpended balances. It is indefinite. Senators can not see. We just say that we appropriate so much for an unexpended balance, and in some cases it has been nearly a billion dollars. Millions of dollars are appropriated that way. So I have not taken into account in these statements the unexpended balances which have been appropriated, which will amount to about \$300,000,000.

It is impossible at this time to accurately determine the exact amount of these reappropriations, but it can be safely said that they will amount to between \$325,000,000 and \$350,000,000, and the very fact that one can not pick up an appropriation bill and quickly ascertain the full amount of appropriations carried is a strong and compelling argument against this method of making



appropriations. It has, however, no doubt served its purpose in that it has made possible an apparent reduction of the estimates in these sums and thus enabled gentlemen on the other side to boast of a reduction which appears on the surface, but which in reality does not exist. If the reductions made in the estimates for the Army, the Navy, and the Shipping Board are excluded, and the amount of reappropriations and expenditures authorized out of governmental receipts are taken into consideration, it will be observed that there have been very slight, if any, actual reductions made in the sum total of the estimates.

Some of our friends talk about the great reduction made in the estimates; that we have reduced millions and millions and millions of dollars in the estimates. That is true, Mr. President. But what does that amount to? Is that economy? Is there a reduction of expenses because the head of a department asks for \$100,000 or \$500,000 and we give him only half of it? What does that amount to? Yet it is claimed they have saved money by giving not what is estimated but half or a third of the estimates.

I remember in a Democratic administration we gave \$500,000,000 less than the estimates. So they have in this administration given millions and millions of dollars less than the estimates. We do not have to give the estimates. We find what is necessary, and give whatever we think is just and proper.

Gentlemen on the majority side of the Chamber have referred to these reductions as savings and as showing great economy on the part of Congress. With all due respect, Mr. President, to those gentlemen who have made that claim, such an insistence is nothing short of ridiculous.

This is also exclusive of the permanent appropriations, amounting to \$1,425,407,752, which item is not included in my statement. That is the permanent appropriations. I am glad the Senator from Utah has an amendment, which he proposes to offer, if he has not already offered it, to have reported to the Senate every year what the permanent appropriations are, so that the Congress may know what money is to be appropriated in these permanent appropriation bills. So I have attempted to find out what these permanent appropriations are, and find they amount to more than \$1,447,000,000.

The reorganization bill which has just been adopted provides for an Army to be maintained in peace times of a maximum strength of 300,000 men and 18,000 officers, and which if enlisted to full strength will cost the Government \$650,000,000 annually to maintain in times of peace.

So that is not included in this estimate.

Then, Mr. President, there are bills upon bills passed making great appropriations which are not included in these appropriation bills. Under the bill we passed last night we will have to appropriate \$37,000,000. I do not know how much will be appropriated for this bill under consideration.

The Spanish-American War pension bill we passed called for \$18,000,000. So we are passing bills to-day authorizing appropriations during this Congress, appropriation after appropriation, bill after bill, which are not included in these estimates. So when you come to estimate and take in these authorized appropriations which will have to be made, this Congress, in my judgment, has appropriated more than \$2,000,000,000. The regular appropriation bills—the 13 supply bills—amount to over a billion, the permanent appropriations over a billion, and the Army bill over six hundred million.

Mr. President, when you add all these appropriations—anticipated, unauthorized, and the 13 supply bills—the amount will be over \$4,000,000,000.

So, Mr. President, I thought I would bring this to the attention of the Senate and make this comparison which I believe is fair and just, taking 1916, two years before the war, and 1921, two years after the war.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments time in answer to what the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has just said. I think the statement just made by the Senator is a wonderful commendation of this Congress in the amount that has been appropriated as shown in the figures which the Senator has given. I think the Senator has been a little too shy in telling the country just what amount of money has been appropriated and what the expenses of the Government were, and I wish to call attention to some of them.

The estimated expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, were \$6,480,506,249.44. The estimated receipts were \$6,506,203,762. I wish to call attention to some of the items that had to be appropriated for this year that were never thought of in the year 1916, and we will see how quickly this billion dollars melts away, as the snows before a noonday sun, and adds a credit of an extra million or more dollars to the Congress making the appropriations for the coming fiscal year.

Why, Mr. President, the appropriations include the entire interest on the public debt for the year. That almost wipes out

at once this billion dollars to which the Senator has called attention with so much apparent satisfaction. That interest must be paid, and this Congress had to appropriate the money to pay the same. There was no interest to be paid in 1916. There goes the billion dollars bragged of at once.

Then, again, we paid \$415,000,000 in this fiscal year as a result of the passage of the Esch-Cummins railroad bill. Again, we advanced loans to our allies, and the money had to be paid out of this year's expenses, another \$450,000,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does the Senator say these are included in the supply bills?

Mr. SMOOT. I say the interest is included, and I say also that the \$415,000,000 for the railroads is included.

Mr. OVERMAN. In what bill?

Mr. SMOOT. The general appropriations covered it.

Mr. OVERMAN. That was the railroad bill. I did not speak of any railroad bill. I spoke of the billion-dollar increase in the regular supply bills and showed where it came.

Mr. SMOOT. The interest must be provided for, as the Senator knows, and not only that but I am calling attention to some of the items that this Congress had to meet that the Congress in 1916 never thought of, nor did anyone in the United States ever dream that such expense would be piled upon the taxpayers of this country. However, the obligations were made, and we had to meet them, no matter what party is in power. If the Democrats were in power they would have to pay the interest upon the obligations of the Government. We have to pay the expenses of the bills Congress passed during war time, leaving the hangover on this Congress to meet, and these are some of the things that this Congress has had to meet.

There has been appropriated this year over \$100,000,000 for the hangover of the war obligations and contracts. We have appropriated that amount already, and we were compelled to do it. Not only that, but we have had to appropriate not only \$100,000,000 for that, but before we get through with this class of claims there will be \$200,000,000 more that we will have to appropriate. I do not know whether the appropriation will be made in the deficiency bill to be passed the next session of Congress, but I do know that we have to meet the obligation and we have to make the appropriation to cover it. That much I do know.

The Government has on hand of Victory and Liberty loan bonds \$221,437,906.99, and certificates of indebtedness amounting to \$150,000,000, for which appropriations have been made with a view of the Government sustaining if possible the price of its Liberty bonds. The Government of the United States has been the largest purchaser, and, perhaps I might say, virtually the only large purchaser to speak of for Liberty bonds. We have that amount of money invested in Liberty bonds, and it has taken money to buy those bonds, and if they had not been bought this year we would have had to buy them at some future time, and this Congress has had to furnish the money for that purpose.

I was in full sympathy with the legislation providing for the purchase of Liberty bonds. I thought it was a good thing, and if it had not been passed I say frankly now that the Liberty bonds would have fallen to the present low level months and months before it finally happened. I am aware that we can not keep appropriating money to buy all the Liberty bonds that will be offered, because if we did and there was a fair market price, the Government of the United States would have to purchase a great proportion of the bond issues.

I wish also to say that the sum mentioned included the \$442,000,000 paid in cash to the Shipping Board and other items of extraordinary nature.

Why talk about a billion dollars? I want to predict now that never within the next quarter of a century will the running expenses of this Government be less than \$3,000,000,000.

If the Senator had desired to make a just comparison between the last Democratic Congress and the present Republican Congress, he would have called attention to the items I have mentioned and then compared the estimates submitted by the Democratic heads of the different departments and the amounts actually appropriated by the Republican Congress. Such a comparison would show that this Democratic administration asked for \$5,000,000,000 to run the Government for the coming fiscal year, and the appropriations granted to cover these estimates by the present Republican Congress saves to the taxpayers \$1,500,000,000.

Until our obligations are paid we will have to pay interest on all the obligations of the Government, including Liberty bonds and the outstanding short-time certificates. Every American citizen must know that for years and years to come the interest obligation of our Government will amount to nearly \$1,000,000,000 a year. That alone was more than all the ap-

appropriations made by the Congress for the fiscal year 1916. All of the appropriations spoken of and as the Senator from North Carolina has read them did not amount to \$1,000,000,000 for the year 1916, and now we are to be required to meet an interest charge for a decade or more of nearly a billion dollars annually.

I do not care whether the Democratic Party is in power or whether the Republican Party is in power, I say that the expenses of the Government will be enormous and it is the duty of every Congressman and every Senator to cut every appropriation to the bone.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the amounts of the estimates for the appropriation bills referred to by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], as well as the total appropriations made as reported by the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

Table comparing by bills estimates of regular annual appropriations for the fiscal year 1921 with the amounts appropriated for the fiscal year 1921 as shown in the statement of Senator Overman.

Title.	Estimates, 1921.	Appropriations, 1921.	Increase of estimates over appropriations.
Agriculture.....	\$37,528,102.00	\$31,714,368.00	\$5,813,734.00
Army.....	982,800,020.00	376,765,824.00	606,034,196.00
Diplomatic and Consular.....	11,243,250.91	9,253,537.91	1,989,713.00
District of Columbia.....	19,179,716.03	18,305,484.87	874,231.16
Fortification.....	117,793,330.00	18,833,442.00	98,959,888.00
Indian.....	12,994,494.27	12,788,397.00	206,097.27
Legislative, etc.....	122,242,849.02	104,735,726.11	17,507,122.91
Military Academy.....	6,778,637.20	2,142,212.70	4,636,424.50
Navy.....	573,131,254.80	433,229,574.00	139,901,680.80
Pensions.....	279,000,000.00	279,000,000.00	.....
Post Office.....	467,497,573.00	462,574,546.00	4,923,027.00
River and harbor.....	42,841,565.00	12,400,000.00	30,441,565.00
Sundry civil.....	906,725,387.10	428,216,944.92	478,508,442.18
Total, regular appropriations	3,579,756,179.33	2,189,960,087.51	1,389,796,121.82

This sum includes the regular estimate of \$215,000,000 and \$64,000,000 provided for in the Fuller bill.

This sum includes the regular estimate of \$391,713,673 and an estimate of \$75,753,900 to continue the temporary increases in compensation provided for in the last annual appropriation bill and House joint resolution No. 151.

The deficiency appropriation bills are not included in the above.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that in my judgment the record of each party upon the subject of extravagance is a record of shame.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I want to say just a word. The Senator from Utah is a little bit unfair. I tried to be fair.

Mr. SMOOT. So did I.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator talks about appropriations in what are known as the deficiency bills. There are three of the great deficiency bills. I never mentioned those. I never put them in my statement.

Mr. SMOOT. That is why the Senator was unfair.

Mr. OVERMAN. There are 13 appropriation bills that I gave, and I stated specially that I did not mention the expenses incident to the war and the hangover. I showed that they had spent a billion dollars more money than we had in the usual supply bills.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows, if he will refer to the appropriation bills, that these items have been appropriated for—not all of them, as I said, but the great bulk of them.

Mr. OVERMAN. We have to appropriate for interest, we have to appropriate for Liberty bonds and a great many other things growing out of the war, but most of those great appropriations occur in the deficiency bills, and I especially stated when I began my statement that I did not want to be unfair and charge the other side with extravagance on account of matters growing out of the war activities, and I specially excepted those.

Mr. SMOOT. The war activities appropriations are not over and we do not know when they will be. I should like to see repealed every law that was passed by Congress granting extraordinary powers to the Executive. I think it would be better for the country, and I am quite sure that it would be better for the Treasury of the United States.

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I wish to say just a few things about the merchant marine bill.

During the war all good, patriotic people did all they could to contribute all they could to help win the war. As a result of the war we now have on hand a large number of ships, something over 2,000. Personally I am opposed to the Government

going into business and conducting any business that citizens of the United States can carry on as an ordinary proposition, but these are extraordinary times, and this is an extraordinary condition. We were forced into owning the ships.

I am a member of the Committee on Commerce, a new member, having been on the committee only a few months. I have a great deal of apprehension about the bill, although I desire to say that the committee worked most diligently on it and they have framed the best law they think can possibly be framed at this time. If I had been preparing the bill, this is not exactly as I would have had it. No doubt it is a good policy to sell useless ships and ships not suited to our purposes. I think that is about as far as I would have gone at the present time. I want to get the Government out of the shipping business as soon as practicable, and without loss, and for the interest of the whole country.

My fear is that these ships will be sacrificed and be allowed to fall into the hands of monopolists. The time has come when we need a merchant marine which will be commensurate with our demands and necessities. We wish to ship our goods to every market in the world. I am, therefore, strongly in favor of building up a great merchant marine.

Mr. President, I wish some such process as I am about to suggest might be adopted. I wish that the Shipping Board would make a calculation in order to ascertain how many ships each State would be entitled to, according to the population of the State. We are told here to-day that sufficient advertisement has not been made of the intended sales of these ships; and I am firmly of the opinion that that is true. Of course, I do not believe in the Government giving its ships away; and while I know that the States, as such, could not buy ships, I should like to have the ownership of the ships spread out all over the United States. I believe that the Shipping Board ought to encourage chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and different business institutions all over the country to look into the desirability of purchasing the ships; and if it could be so arranged that each State would be entitled to an option on the purchase of so many ships, perhaps the citizens of the States would get busy and form corporations and combine with other people and help buy the ships.

The plan proposed in the bill is to sell the ships at a very reasonable figure—perhaps it is left to the board as to what is a reasonable figure—on long time, with a very small cash payment, the interest, I believe, to be fixed by the board. I think, perhaps, the rate of interest should have been fixed by the bill; but I do not care to criticize what the committee has done.

It is very important, however, that the ownership of these ships shall be distributed all over the United States. During the recent World War there was a great congestion of goods for shipment in the northern ports, and there has been congestion since that time. It is said that there was a string of loaded cars from New York back to Cleveland and possibly farther west. I wish that the ports of this country could be opened clear around the water front of the United States. Formerly we had great shipping from my section of the country, and it was stated here recently that some ships had been allocated to that section and that the shipping business there has grown rapidly. A gentleman called to see me here last week, and he said he was considering the proposition of establishing a line of ships from Charleston or Savannah and that he would operate as many as a ship a day. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the citizens of every State will have something which they shall desire to ship, and they certainly will be interested in imports. I wish that the coal interests, the beef interests, the grain interests, the tobacco interests, the cotton-mill interests, the cotton-growing interests, and the farming interests generally all over this country would cooperate and buy these ships. If there is going to be any money made out of the operation, if these ships are to be sacrificed, I think the people all over the country ought to get some of the benefit of the transaction. I do not believe it is to the interest of our trade that the ownership of more vessels should be placed in the congested ports.

We read in the newspapers here within the last few days of the longshoremen's strike; that ships can not be loaded, but are tied up in New York; in fact, the people there admit that to be the situation. The conditions in those ports are such that they can not handle the freight, and many of the ships have been diverted to Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Norfolk. It is a sad day for the prosperity of our country when a few men, be they longshoremen or others, shall tie up the entire commerce of this country. It is impossible to get trains through here from the South; they, too, are tied up. I hope, by diversifying the ownership of the ships, that we shall open up the ports on the South Atlantic, on the Gulf, and on the Pacific coast; that we shall thereby get our goods rapidly to market; and that it will not be



within the power of any few men to tie up the commerce of the country.

Yesterday I received a long-distance message, over a distance of 500 miles, from a port where it was stated that the people there had a large quantity of goods; that they were anxious for more ships to be allocated there; that the business was rapidly developing.

Just recently five of the South Atlantic ports sent a very large delegation out West; they went to Detroit and, possibly, as far as Minneapolis. I think the distance from Charleston or Savannah to Chicago is practically the same as it is from there to New York. So if we should open up the South Atlantic and Gulf ports, instead of railroads being congested and not being able to handle our freight, the freight being shipped to those ports, we should get our goods to market more quickly and cheaply, and the whole country would thereby be benefited.

I was talking the other day to a supercargo, who said, "We were tied up in New York some three or four weeks; the expense of the crew was going on; we had to keep fires up and burn coal." Then they went to New Orleans and they were tied up there for some time and the same expense was incurred. Some kind of condition ought to be established whereby such a situation would be impossible. As a result of these tie-ups, during which time expenses continue, money is thrown away and no one receives the benefit of it, and by reason of such conduct the cost of living piles up and mounts higher and higher.

So I hope that there will be thoroughgoing advertisement by the Shipping Board. If I had my way, there would be no hurry to sell these ships, but the sales would be advertised thoroughly all over the United States, so as to allow every interest to come in and bid on the ships. Even inland cities would take pride in participating, if they understood the situation and the favorable terms upon which they could purchase the ships, and perhaps would form companies and help buy them, and thereby make possible a better price for the United States and insure some benefit to everybody. Not only that, but if our constituents in the various States owned stock in the shipping companies we would be more likely, perhaps, to pass laws to meet the conditions that might arise. So I believe that the board should not be in great haste, even if this law is passed, to dump the ships on the market at any prices they can get for them. I think there is quite a difference between the situation affecting ships and that affecting the railroads. We want to build up a merchant marine of which we will be proud; we want to carry and distribute a large proportion of our merchandise in our own vessels, as we did long ago, before the days of the Civil War.

#### FORCE AND SALARIES IN PATENT OFFICE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11984) to increase the force and salaries in the Patent Office, and for other purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, after consultation with members of the committee and others, I am authorized, so far as we can, to accept the amendment that is now pending, offered by the Senator from Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have two other amendments which I desire to offer to the committee amendments.

On page 12, line 11, I move to insert the words "license and," so as to read:

And the Federal Trade Commission is hereby authorized and empowered to license and collect fees and royalties for licenses.

It is merely a grammatical correction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 12, in line 11, after the word "empowered," it is proposed to insert the words "license and."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On page 12, after line 21, I move to amend the committee amendment by inserting the proviso which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 12, at the end of line 21, after the word "benefit," it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That nothing herein shall be construed to give to said commission or any other governmental agency any authority to engage in the manufacture of any such invention or patented article.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I call attention to page 2, where I desire to offer a number of amendments. On that page, in line 16, I move to strike out "forty-seven" and insert "thirty."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 16, after the word "examiners" it is proposed to strike out "forty-seven" and insert "thirty."

Mr. NORRIS. There is no objection to that amendment, so far as I know.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KING. In line 17, on the same page, before the words "first assistants," I move to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five."

Mr. NORRIS. There is no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KING. In line 18, on the same page, I move to strike out "thirty" and insert the word "twenty."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, line 18, where the word "thirty" occurs in two places it is proposed to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. On the same page, on line 19, I move to strike out "one hundred" before the words "second assistants," and insert "seventy-five."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, line 19, before the words "second assistants," it is proposed to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. On line 21 of the same page I move to strike out the words "one hundred," relating to the third assistants, and insert "seventy-five."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. In lines 22 and 23 I move to strike out "one hundred" before the words "fourth assistants" and insert in lieu thereof "seventy-five."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have suggested another amendment to the Senator from Nebraska, which he is not willing to accept. I shall not ask a vote upon it, but I call his attention to it, and I ask his serious consideration to the matter when the bill goes to conference. The amendment is on page 1, line 6, after the word "section," to insert the words "for the fiscal year 1921," so that it will read:

The salaries of the officers mentioned in the preceding section for the fiscal year 1921 shall be as follows:

The Senator will not accept that amendment, and he has been so patient that I will not ask for a vote and permit the bill to be put upon its passage.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the force and salaries in the Patent Office and to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to accept and administer, for the benefit of the public and the encouragement of industry, inventions, patents, and patent rights, and for other purposes."

Mr. NORRIS. I move that the Senate ask for a conference with the House on the bill and amendments and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. NORRIS, Mr. BRANDEGEE, and Mr. KIRBY conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES.

Mr. POMERENE. On yesterday I presented Senate resolution 383, which I had hoped to have the consent of the Senate to take up and dispose of. An objection was made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Under the rules of the Senate I am not entirely clear as to whether the resolution should go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I find on investigation of the precedents that at times similar resolutions have been thus referred, and at other times they have not been. I am, however, going to move that the resolution be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with instructions to report on the convening of the Senate on the calendar day of Saturday, June 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

## BITUMINOUS COAL SITUATION.

Mr. LODGE. I promised several Senators that we should have an executive session.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has a resolution of inquiry. It will take only a moment, and I appeal to the Senator to allow it to be considered.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I move that the Senate take up and act upon Senate resolution 374, a resolution to get certain information from the Interstate Commerce Commission dealing with the coal question. I understand that there is no opposition to it. I have talked with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and he now has no objection. He objected to it the other day.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to say to the Senator that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] asked me, if the resolution came up, simply to notify him.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. He told me yesterday to proceed in his absence.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from West Virginia has told the Senator from Massachusetts he has no objection, I have none.

The resolution (S. Res. 374) submitted by Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts on May 28, 1920, was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized and directed to investigate and report to the Senate as soon as practicable—

(a) What amount of bituminous coal mined in the Pennsylvania and West Virginia fields during the months of March and April, 1920, was dumped over tidewater piers;

(b) What is the probable amount of the coal mined in these fields that will be shipped to tidewater in the next six months;

(c) What percentage of the coal dumped at tidewater during March and April was used for foreign bunkers and export cargo;

(d) From what ports were these exports made, and how much from each;

(e) What percentage of the coal dumped at tidewater in March and April moved coastwise;

(f) How many railway cars were used in these months to carry the coal which went offshore for foreign bunkers and cargoes;

(g) To what extent has the price of coal for locomotive use on American railroads been raised due to the upbidding of coal prices by foreign buyers;

(h) To what extent does the eastern coast section of the United States depend on shipments of bituminous coal by water; and

(i) What is the total tonnage of bituminous coal shipped by water in normal times to supply the necessary requirements of the eastern coast section.

## EXAMINATION OF APPLICANTS FOR POSTMASTERSHIPS.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I offer a resolution and ask that it lie on the table until to-morrow.

The resolution (S. Res. 385) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas the United States Civil Service Commission is required under certain conditions by Executive order to certify to the Postmaster General the result of an open competitive examination to test the fitness of applicants for a vacancy in the position of postmaster of any office of the first, second, or third class; and

Whereas the commission is further required to give preference in such examinations and certifications to persons honorably discharged from the military, naval, or marine service of the United States; and

Whereas complaint has been made that such persons have not been accorded such preference in such examinations and certifications: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, by subcommittee or otherwise, is authorized and directed to investigate and report to the Senate as soon as practicable—

(a) The method and system of rating the examinations by the United States Civil Service Commission of applicants for a vacancy in the position of postmaster of any office of the first, second, or third class.

(b) Whether persons honorably discharged from the military, naval, or marine service of the United States are given preference in such examination ratings.

(c) Whether such persons are given preference in the certification made by the commission to the Postmaster General.

(d) Such additional matters relating to such preference for such vacancies as the committee may deem advisable.

Such committee is hereby authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to sit during the sessions or recesses of the Congress, at Washington or at any other place in the United States, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before such committee, such stenographer's service to be rendered at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, the expenses in carrying out the provisions of this resolution to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

## INCOME AND PROFITS TAX RETURNS.

Mr. HARRIS. I give notice that to-morrow I shall ask that the Senate discharge the Finance Committee from the consideration of Senate joint resolution 146, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the Senate certain detailed information secured from income and profits tax returns of taxable year 1918.

## EXPORTATION OF SUGAR.

Mr. McNARY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4420, to prohibit the

exportation of sugar, and for other purposes. It is a very important measure. I think its disposition will require only a brief time, and I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understood that we were going to have an executive session at this time. It is impossible to consider the bill now.

Mr. DIAL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	Nugent	Smoot
Borah	Harris	Overman	Spencer
Brandegee	Henderson	Page	Stanley
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Sterling
Capper	Kenyon	Phipps	Sutherland
Curtis	Keyes	Pomerene	Swanson
Dial	King	Ransdell	Thomas
Dillingham	Lodge	Reed	Townsend
Fernald	McCumber	Robinson	Trammell
Gay	McNary	Sheppard	Underwood
Gerry	Nelson	Simmons	Walsh, Mass.
Glass	New	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Hale	Norris	Smith, Md.	Wolcott

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take up for consideration Senate bill 4420, to prohibit the exportation of sugar, and for other purposes.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 30 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

## EXPORTATION OF SUGAR.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4420) to prohibit the exportation of sugar, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether the bill will provoke long discussion.

Mr. McNARY. I can only say to the Senator from Colorado that I hope not.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon if it is a Senate bill or a House bill?

Mr. McNARY. It is a Senate bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, it is absolutely impossible to secure the consideration of it by the House. So why take up the little time we have left now in the discussion of such a bill?

Mr. McNARY. I will say to the Senator from Utah that I also have great hope in this respect, that the House will take it up for early consideration to-morrow if it passes the Senate this evening. It is a bill that I think possesses great merit and that the people of the country, who want sugar, will be happy to have written on the statute books. I imagine that there will not be much opposition on the floor of the Senate, and little, if any, in the House. It is proposed legislation that ought to be enacted before the expiration of the present session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. GAY. I object.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take up for consideration the bill (S. 4420) to prohibit the exportation of sugar, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I do not think it wise to take up the bill at this time. It is a very questionable bill, in my judgment, and it is very doubtful whether it would help in any way. The proposition is to put an embargo on the exportation of sugar from the United States when the sugar is not here, when we do not produce enough in our own country to meet our own needs. It must come in from other countries to furnish our people what they require.

If we put an embargo on sugar, we are likely to deter imports, we are likely to interfere and cause persons who desire to refine it and ship it out to hesitate about bringing it in. I can not see any reason why they should bring it in if we forbid them subsequently to ship it out should they wish to sell it abroad. I can not see any reasonable expectation that we will increase our supply of sugar by putting an embargo on its export, when it has not yet been imported.

Mr. McNARY. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that the bill contains a provision exempting from the operation of the provisions of the bill the sugar brought here on toll, owned by foreign nations or their nationals.

The purpose of this bill is this: When sugar is acquired by refiners or speculators or jobbers in this country and brought here and refined, the bill provides that it shall be kept here and



sold to American consumers, thereby adding to their supply. Anyone engaged in the sugar business ought to be satisfied with the profit they can make at prices which they charge the American public to-day and should not be permitted to sell it to the nationals of other countries. That is the purpose of the bill. It does not affect in any regard sugar brought here for refining. It only will keep here the sugar that is brought over, that ought to remain and be sold to the American public at a fair price.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator has the figures there. May I inquire how much has been sent out of the United States within the last year?

Mr. McNARY. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that the statistics supplied me by the Government show that 555,000,000 pounds, aggregating about 257,000 tons, have been exported.

A part of this sugar was brought in here and refined on toll, and the Government contends that much of it has been brought in by speculators and refiners and sold and taken out of the country at a higher price. It is that sugar that I want to retain in this country.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, did not the expert say that he could not tell what proportion was brought in for that purpose; that he did not know?

Mr. McNARY. He said it was a very large proportion; that he did not know the exact figures, but that it was a tremendous quantity.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oregon state to us that any of the sugar which was exported out of the country was primarily produced in this country?

Mr. McNARY. No; very little of such sugar was exported.

Mr. REED. All of it was brought in from abroad and refined here, so that our refineries had the work; then a part of it was sent abroad—the amount the Senator speaks of—but it was all foreign sugar, which was brought here and refined in bond.

Mr. McNARY. That is true, the simple fact being that the sugar that we consume, to, a very large extent, comes from Cuba.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator from Oregon misunderstood the latter part of the question of the Senator from Missouri. The sugar was not all refined in bond.

Mr. McNARY. No; I did not understand that part of the question of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Then, they had to pay duty on it?

Mr. McNARY. They would pay the duty on the sugar brought here from abroad by refineries and refined and sold in this country; but that does not apply to the sugar which the Senator from Missouri has in mind, namely, the sugar which was brought over which was owned by foreigners and refined at our refineries and sold abroad.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Oregon has referred to the large amount of sugar that was exported. Probably a year ago, pursuant to an arrangement which the United States had made with our allies, we bought a certain amount of sugar, agreeing that a portion of it should be sent to our allies? Is not all that sugar included in the amount to which the Senator has just referred?

Mr. McNARY. I will state to the Senator from Ohio that probably some of it is included; but, from information I have obtained from many of the refiners, but little of the sugar that has been exported comes under that classification.

Mr. POMERENE. The only thought I had in mind was that if we had a contract of that kind which was not complied with, certainly we would all desire to keep good faith.

Mr. McNARY. That is quite true.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am thoroughly in sympathy with the bill the consideration of which is proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]; I should be very glad to have it passed; I should certainly vote for it, and I have no objection to offer to it; but there is a House joint resolution here which is ready to be reported from the Judiciary Committee, which I consider of very great importance. I refer to the joint resolution proposing to repeal the war legislation. That measure comes from the Judiciary Committee with a favorable report. I repeat that it is a House joint resolution, and if we pass it I hope it will become a law. So it seems to me that the Senator from Oregon might be willing, if the consideration of the measure to which I refer will not take too long, to give the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] an opportunity to present it to the Senate for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon withdraw his motion?

Mr. McNARY. No; I had rather at this time have it finally decided what disposition the Senate desires to make of my proposal to bring the sugar bill before the body for consideration.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I quite agree with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in the thought that it will not take very long to dispose of the measure to which he refers, and it is important, as the Senator from Massachusetts has indicated, to dispose of it. I hope, therefore, that the Senator from Oregon will yield for its consideration and disposition.

Mr. McNARY. I should like to do that; but it will take but a few moments to have some disposition made of my motion. Then, if the Senate shall vote to consider my bill, I shall yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, would not the Senator from Oregon be satisfied if the Senate would grant him unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the sugar bill immediately upon the conclusion of the matter suggested by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. McNARY. I would.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then I will ask, if the Senator from Oregon is too modest to do it, that unanimous consent be granted to proceed to the consideration of the sugar bill as soon as the joint resolution repealing war legislation shall have been disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, my attention was diverted, and I did not hear the Senator's request—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. My request was that as soon as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] shall have had the joint resolution repealing war legislation disposed of the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the sugar bill.

Mr. GAY. That may be done only if a majority of the Senate is in favor of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is an objection to the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. McNARY. I think that I shall insist on the motion which I have made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What is the motion, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is to proceed to the consideration of the sugar embargo bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I want to say a word or two further before that bill is taken up. How can anyone hope that we shall increase our supply of sugar by forbidding the exportation of sugar which has not yet been brought into the United States?

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. Might we not reduce the price of sugar to the consumers in the United States by preventing a part of the sugar which is now in the United States from being shipped out of the United States to some other country?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; if we should limit such exportation to sugar that is now in the United States such a measure might possibly be of some value.

Mr. McNARY. Let me ask the Senator from Georgia a question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will let the Senator do so.

Mr. McNARY. In reading the provisions of the bill, does it not clearly appear that the bill does not apply to sugar that is brought here which may be refined and resold to the American public, and particularly exempts sugar which is brought here to be refined on toll? Therefore, the Senator's objection to the consideration of the bill falls because of the very provisions of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No. I think the Senator from Oregon takes an incorrect view of the measure. It broadly applies to all sugar that may at any time be in the United States except that which is brought here by foreign agencies to be refined and returned to them. It might deter the bringing of sugar into the United States. If the sugar produced in the United States was ample to meet our wants, and we put an embargo on exports, it might increase the volume of sugar retained for the use of the people of the United States; but when the sugar is not here and has to be brought here, when it is not pretended that the supply now in the United States is at all sufficient to meet the wants of the United States, to put an

embargo on the export of sugar is to discourage the bringing of sugar from Cuba here. The man who intends to refine sugar and send it away from here, the man who has a contract with the foreign market to furnish sugar, will not bring it here at all. Mr. McNARY. Let me ask the Senator another question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will yield in a moment. Again, the man who is in doubt about whether he will sell sugar in the United States or sell it in the foreign market will hesitate to bring it into the United States. The only benefit would be to hold the sugar which comes here. We do not produce in the Philippines, Hawaii, and in continental United States anything like what we need, but depend upon foreign production for our supply. If we limit our sugar to the sugar produced in the United States, our supply would be less than a third of what we would consume. The sugar is not in the United States now to meet our wants for any considerable length of time; sugar must be imported into the United States to furnish our people what they need. Now, what possible help could an embargo on exports of sugar be to the supply in the United States when the sugar must be imported into the United States to give the supply? Possibly upon the theory that somebody will bring it in and we will grab it when it gets here; but an intelligent man will not bring it in if he wants to ship it somewhere else; he will shun bringing it to a place where the embargo cuts off a part of his market; and we are far more likely to lessen our supply than to increase it by this proposed legislation.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. We are greatly pressed for time now, and, while I wish to hear the Senator's argument if we take the bill up, we have not decided as yet to take it up; and I think we would save time if we could vote now on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to give the Senate an idea of the undesirability of taking up the bill, by showing that the bill will consume time if taken up, and do no good if passed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well; but I hope we will soon be able to have a vote.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wanted to indicate to the Senate the fact that if this bill is taken up, it will involve a long and elaborate discussion. It is a most doubtful piece of economic legislation; it is a piece of legislation which can not in any sense furnish a guaranty of any help for our supply of sugar, but, on the contrary, some of us believe it will endanger our supply.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. RANDELL. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Do not do that now.

Mr. RANDELL. We are going to vote on this matter, Senators; it is a very important matter affecting my State. I do not want it to be settled at this session and we can not settle it at this session. If it is attempted to settle it at this session, it will be necessary to have a quorum of the Senate to do it.

Mr. THOMAS. Some of us will vote "nay."

Mr. RANDELL. If the Senate will vote down the motion, very well. I withdraw the point.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is obvious that this bill is going to require considerable debate.

Mr. RANDELL. I am prepared to discuss it at considerable length.

Mr. LODGE. We have measures here, some of which are of the very first importance, such as the one in charge of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], which is a House measure. I hope the Senator from Oregon will be willing to allow us to take up the joint resolution to repeal the war legislation, for it is of very great moment.

Mr. McNARY. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that if the Senate will consent to the consideration of the sugar bill I will gladly yield to the Senator from South Dakota, and also to the Senator from Washington, for the two conference reports which he will soon have to present, and to any other more immediate impending legislation. That ought to satisfy the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Those of us who are opposed to taking up this bill certainly do not want to make any such arrangement.

Mr. LODGE. Of course not.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We are entitled to begin our fight now on the motion to take up the bill, and we certainly can not

consent to an arrangement of that kind. If the Senate takes up this bill, it will have to take it up with consciousness of what is ahead in the Senate.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon to take up the so-called sugar bill. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

#### AMITY OF ENGLISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a Senate resolution, which I ask to have read and go over under the rule.

The resolution (S. Res. 386) was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the relations of amity and good will which the late war with Germany established among the English-speaking peoples constitute the best guaranty of the future peace of the world and the final refuge of institutions founded upon liberty and justice protected by law.*

*That any breach or serious disturbance of these relations would jeopardize the permanency of modern civilization.*

*We therefore deplore and denounce all indignities toward the official representatives or the flag of any foreign Government with which the United States is at peace, and call upon the properly constituted authorities to utilize all lawful means for preventing their recurrence.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

#### ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY LEFFINGWELL.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I present a copy of an address delivered by Assistant Secretary Leffingwell before the Academy of Political Science in New York, with a view to its reference to the Committee on Printing, to the end of making it a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it will be so referred.

#### REPEAL OF WAR-TIME LEGISLATION.

Mr. STERLING. From the Committee on the Judiciary, I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 373) declaring that certain acts of Congress, joint resolutions, and proclamations shall be construed as if the war had ended and the present or existing emergency expired. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That in the interpretation of any provision relating to the date of the termination of the present war or of the present or existing emergency in any acts of Congress, joint resolutions, or proclamations of the President containing provisions contingent upon the date of the termination of the war or of the present or existing emergency, or on the existence of a state of war, the date when this resolution becomes effective shall be construed and treated as the date of the termination of the war or of the present or existing emergency, notwithstanding any provision in any act of Congress or joint resolution providing any other mode of determining the date of the termination of the war or of the present or existing emergency. Excepting, however, from the operation and effect of this resolution the following acts and proclamations, to wit: The act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917, the amendment thereto entitled "The food control and District of Columbia rents act," approved October 22, 1919, the act known as the trading with the enemy act, approved October 6, 1917, and the first, second, third, and fourth Liberty bond acts, the supplement to second Liberty bond act, and the Victory Liberty loan act; also the proclamations issued under the authority conferred by the acts herein excepted from the effect and operation of this resolution.*

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 14, after the word "act" and the semicolon, it is proposed to insert:

*And the act entitled "An act to prevent in time of war departure from and entry into the United States contrary to the public safety," approved May 22, 1918.*

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to submit a further report on the merchant marine bill, making it conform to the point of order made in the House. I ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.



The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 35, 44, 47, 49, 122, 125, 138, and 149.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 45, 46, 50, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 143, and 148, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "in this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) That section 3 of the 'shipping act, 1916,' is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That a board is hereby created to be known as the United States Shipping Board and hereinafter referred to as the board. The board shall be composed of seven commissioners, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and the President shall designate the member to act as chairman of the board, and the board may elect one of its members as vice chairman. Such commissioners shall be appointed as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act and shall continue in office two for a term of one year, and the remaining five for terms of two, three, four, five, and six years, respectively, from the date of their appointment, the term of each to be designated by the President, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the commissioner whom he succeeds.

"The commissioners shall be appointed with due regard to their fitness for the efficient discharge of the duties imposed on them by this act, and two shall be appointed from the States touching the Pacific Ocean, two from the States touching the Atlantic Ocean, one from the States touching the Gulf of Mexico, one from the States touching the Great Lakes, and one from the interior, but not more than one shall be appointed from the same State. Not more than four of the commissioners shall be appointed from the same political party. A vacancy in the board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments. No commissioner shall take any part in the consideration or decision of any claim or particular controversy in which he has a pecuniary interest.

"Each commissioner shall devote his time to the duties of his office, and shall not be in the employ of or hold any official relation to any common carrier or other person subject to this act, nor while holding such office acquire any stock or bonds thereof or become pecuniarily interested in any such carrier.

"The duties of the board may be so divided that under its supervision the directorship of various activities may be assigned to one or more commissioners. Any commissioner may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. A vacancy in the board shall not impair the right of the remaining members of the board to exercise all its powers. The board shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

"The board may adopt rules and regulations in regard to its procedure and the conduct of its business. The board may employ within the limits of appropriations made therefor by Congress such attorneys as it finds necessary for proper legal service to the board in the conduct of its work, or for proper representation of the public interest in investigations made by it or proceedings pending before it whether at the board's own instance or upon complaint, or to appear for or represent the board in any case in court or other tribunal. The board shall have such other rights and perform such other duties not inconsistent with the merchant marine act, 1920, as are conferred by existing law upon the board in existence at the time this section as amended takes effect.

"The commissioners in office at the time this section as amended takes effect shall hold office until all the commissioners provided for in this section as amended are appointed and qualify."

"(b) The first sentence of section 4 of the 'shipping act, 1916,' is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That each member of the board shall receive a salary of \$12,000 per annum."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "consistent with good business methods and the objects and purposes to be attained by this act, at public or private competitive sale after appraisal and due advertisement, to"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "existing freight rates and prospects of their maintenance"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and any other facts or conditions that would influence a prudent, solvent business man in the sale of similar vessels or property which he is not forced to sell"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "not inconsistent with the provisions of section 5 (except that completion of the payment of the purchase price and interest shall not be deferred more than 10 years after the making of the contract of sale)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "; but no such sale shall be made unless the board, after diligent effort, has been unable to sell, in accordance with the terms and conditions of section 5, such vessels to persons citizens of the United States, and has, upon an affirmative vote of not less than five of its members, spread upon the minutes of the board, determined to make such sale; and it shall make as a part of its records a full statement of its reasons for making such sale. Deferred payments of purchase price of vessels under this section shall bear interest at the rate of not less than 5½ per cent per annum payable semiannually"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 6 and 7 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the following words: "where adequate terminal connections with rail carriers can and will be made or already exist"; in line 17 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the words "of the United States" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "referred to in section 4 of this act or otherwise acquired by the board"; in line 30 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment, after the word "authorized," insert the following: "notwithstanding the act entitled 'An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce,' approved March 3, 1891"; at the end of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment change the period to a colon and add the following: "And provided further, That whenever the board shall determine, as provided in this act, that trade conditions warrant the establishment of a service or additional service under Government administration where a service is already being given by persons, citizens of the United States, the rates and charges for such Government service shall not be less than the cost thereof, including a proper interest and depreciation charge on the value of Government vessels and equipment employed therein"; and in line 8 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment, after the word "world," insert the words "and domestic"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment, after the word "board," insert a comma and the following: "in cooperation with the Secretary of War"; in line 6 of the matter proposed by the Senate amend-

ment, after the word "rail," insert a comma and the word "water"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert in lieu "\$25,000,000"; and in line 4 of the Senate amendment, after "construction" insert "loan"; and in line 5 of the Senate amendment strike out "in the construction, or"; in line 21 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment, strike out everything after the word "built" down to and including the word "semiannually," at the end of the matter proposed by such Senate amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "may be reconditioned and kept in suitable repair and until"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "pursuant to the policy and purposes declared in sections 1 and 5 of this act; and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall continue in existence and have authority to operate vessels, unless otherwise directed by law, until all vessels are sold in accordance with the provisions of this act, the provision"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "10 hereof, and for the construction loan fund authorized in section 11 hereof"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "and construction loan funds"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 17. That the board is authorized and directed to take over on January 1, 1921, the possession and control of, and to maintain and develop, all docks, piers, warehouses, wharves and terminal equipment and facilities, including all leasehold easements, rights of way, riparian rights and other rights, estates and interests therein or appurtenant thereto, acquired by the President by or under the act entitled 'An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes,' approved March 28, 1918.

"The possession and control of such other docks, piers, warehouses, wharves and terminal equipment and facilities or parts thereof, including all leasehold easements, rights of way, riparian rights and other rights, estates or interests therein or appurtenant thereto which were acquired by the War Department or the Navy Department for military or naval purposes during the war emergency may be transferred by the President to the board whenever the President deems such transfer to be for the best interests of the United States.

"The President may at any time he deems it necessary, by order setting out the need therefor and fixing the period of such need, permit or transfer the possession and control of any part of the property taken over by or transferred to the board under this section to the War Department or the Navy Department for their needs, and when in the opinion of the President such need therefor ceases the possession and control of such property shall revert to the board. None of such property shall be sold except as may be hereafter provided by law."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment, after the word "chartered," at the end of the line preceding and the beginning of said line 12, insert the words "by the board"; in lieu of the last two paragraphs of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"It shall be unlawful to sell, transfer or mortgage, or, except under regulations prescribed by the board, to charter, any vessel purchased from the board or documented under the laws

of the United States to any person not a citizen of the United States, or to put the same under a foreign registry or flag, without first obtaining the board's approval.

"Any vessel chartered, sold, transferred or mortgaged to a person not a citizen of the United States or placed under a foreign registry or flag, or operated, in violation of any provision of this section shall be forfeited to the United States, and whoever violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than five years, or both."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 19. (1) The board is authorized and directed in aid of the accomplishment of the purposes of this act (a) to make all necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act; (b) to make rules and regulations affecting shipping in the foreign trade not in conflict with law in order to adjust or meet general or special conditions unfavorable to shipping in the foreign trade, whether in any particular trade or upon any particular route or in commerce generally and which arise out of or result from foreign laws, rules or regulations or from competitive methods or practices employed by owners, operators, agents, or masters of vessels of a foreign country; and (c) to request the head of any department, board, bureau, or agency of the Government to suspend, modify, or annul rules or regulations which have been established by such department, board, bureau, or agency, or to make new rules or regulations affecting shipping in the foreign trade other than such rules or regulations relating to the Public Health Service, the Consular Service, and the Steamboat-Inspection Service.

"(2) No rule or regulation shall hereafter be established by any department, board, bureau, or agency of the Government which affect shipping in the foreign trade, except rules or regulations affecting the Public Health Service, the Consular Service, and the Steamboat-Inspection Service, until such rule or regulation has been submitted to the board for its approval and final action has been taken thereon by the board or the President.

"(3) Whenever the head of any department, board, bureau, or agency of the Government refuses to suspend, modify, or annul any rule or regulation, or make a new rule or regulation upon request of the board, as provided in subdivision (c) of paragraph (1) of this section, or objects to the decision of the board in respect to the approval of any rule or regulation, as provided in paragraph (2) of this section, either the board or the head of the department, board, bureau, or agency which has established or is attempting to establish the rule or regulation in question, may submit the facts to the President, who is hereby authorized to establish or suspend, modify, or annul such rule or regulation.

"(4) No rule or regulation shall be established which in any manner gives vessels owned by the United States any preference or favor over those vessels documented under the laws of the United States and owned by persons who are citizens of the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 20. (1) That section 14 of the shipping act, 1916, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. That no common carrier by water shall, directly or indirectly, in respect to the transportation by water of passengers or property between a port of a State, Territory, District, or possession of the United States and any other such port or a port of a foreign country—

"First. Pay, or allow, or enter into any combination, agreement, or understanding, express or implied, to pay or allow, a deferred rebate to any shipper. The term "deferred rebate" in this act means a return of any portion of the freight money by a carrier to any shipper as a consideration for the giving of all or any portion of his shipments to the same or any other carrier, or for any other purpose, the payment of which is deferred beyond the completion of the service for which it is paid, and is made only if, during both the period for which computed and the period of deferment, the shipper has complied with the terms of the rebate agreement or arrangement.

"Second. Use a fighting ship either separately or in conjunction with any other carrier, through agreement or otherwise. The term "fighting ship" in this act means a vessel used in a particular trade by a carrier or group of carriers for



the purpose of excluding, preventing, or reducing competition by driving another carrier out of said trade.

"Third. Retaliate against any shipper by refusing, or threatening to refuse, space accommodations when such are available, or resort to other discriminating or unfair methods, because such shipper has patronized any other carrier or has filed a complaint charging unfair treatment, or for any other reason.

"Fourth. Make any unfair or unjustly discriminatory contract with any shipper based on the volume of freight offered, or unfairly treat or unjustly discriminate against any shipper in the matter of (a) cargo-space accommodations or other facilities, due regard being had for the proper loading of the vessel and the available tonnage; (b) the loading and landing of freight in proper condition; or (c) the adjustment and settlement of claims.

"Any carrier who violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not more than \$25,000 for each offense."

"(2) The shipping act, 1916, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 14 a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 14a. The board upon its own initiative may, or upon complaint shall, after due notice to all parties in interest and hearing, determine whether any person, not a citizen of the United States and engaged in transportation by water of passengers or property—

"(1) Has violated any provision of section 14, or

"(2) Is a party to any combination, agreement, or understanding, express or implied, that involves in respect to transportation of passengers or property between foreign ports, deferred rebates or any other unfair practice designated in section 14, and that excludes from admission upon equal terms with all other parties thereto, a common carrier by water, which is a citizen of the United States and which has applied for such admission.

"If the board determines that any such person has violated any such provision or is a party to any such combination, agreement, or understanding, the board shall thereupon certify such fact to the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary shall thereafter refuse such person the right of entry for any ship owned or operated by him or by any carrier directly or indirectly controlled by him, into any port of the United States, or any Territory, District, or possession thereof, until the board certifies that the violation has ceased or such combination, agreement, or understanding has been terminated."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 1 and 2 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "one year from the enactment of this act" and insert in lieu "February 1, 1922"; in line 11 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the words "within a year" and insert the words "by February 1, 1922"; at the end of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment change the period to a colon and insert the following: "And provided further, That the foregoing provisions of this section shall not take effect with reference to the Philippine Islands until the President of the United States after a full investigation of the local needs and conditions shall, by proclamation, declare that an adequate shipping service has been established as herein provided and fix a date for the going into effect of the same." In line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 23" and insert in lieu "Sec. 21"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 10 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the word "wholly"; in line 13 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the word "wholly"; in line 15 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the words "wholly in American" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in such," and after the word "ownership," in said line 15, insert the following: "subject to the rules and regulations of such trade: *Provided*, That the board is authorized to issue permits for the carrying of passengers in foreign ships, if it deems it necessary so to do, operating between the Territory of Hawaii and the Pacific coast up to February 1, 1922"; in line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 24," and insert in lieu "Sec. 22"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the last paragraph of the Senate amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with

an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Nothing herein shall be affected by the act entitled 'An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce,' approved March 3, 1891"; in line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 26" and insert in lieu "Sec. 24"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Beginning in line 6 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out everything after the word "Shipping" down to and including "citizens," in line 9 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment; and in line 1 of the Senate amendment change the section number from "27" to "25"; in lines 10 and 11 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the words "or such approved organization"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the word "twelve" and insert in lieu thereof the word "sixteen."

Between the first and second paragraphs of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert a separate paragraph, as follows:

"The privilege bestowed by this section on vessels of the United States shall be extended in so far as the foreign trade is concerned to the cargo vessels of any nation which allows the like privilege to cargo vessels of the United States in trades not restricted to vessels under its own flag."

In line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 28" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 26."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 8 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the word "wholly," and in line 11 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the figures "24" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "22." At the end of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That this section shall not apply to merchandise transported between points within the continental United States, excluding Alaska, over through routes heretofore or hereafter recognized by the Interstate Commerce Commission for which routes rate tariffs have been or shall hereafter be filed with said commission when such routes are in part over Canadian rail lines and their own or other connecting water facilities: *Provided further*, That this section shall not become effective upon the Yukon River until the Alaska Railroad shall be completed and the Shipping Board shall find that proper facilities will be furnished for transportation by persons citizens of the United States for properly handling the traffic." In line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 29" and insert in lieu "Sec. 27"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 17 and 18 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "and owned by persons who are citizens of the United States"; in line 22 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the words "and owned"; in line 30 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the word "shall" and insert in lieu thereof the word "may"; in line 1 of the proposed amendment strike out the numerals "30" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "28"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 29. (a) That whenever used in this section—

"(1) The term 'association' means any association, exchange, pool, combination, or other arrangement for concerted action; and

"(2) The term 'marine insurance companies' means any persons, companies, or associations authorized to write marine insurance or reinsurance under the laws of the United States or of a State, Territory, District, or possession thereof.

"(b) Nothing contained in the 'antitrust laws' as designated in section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, shall be construed as declaring illegal an association entered into by marine insurance companies for the following purposes: To transact a marine

insurance and reinsurance business in the United States and in foreign countries and to reinsure or otherwise apportion among its membership the risks undertaken by such association or any of the component members."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 30. SUBSEC. A. That this section may be cited as the 'ship-mortgage act, 1920.'"

"DEFINITIONS."

"SUBSEC. B. When used in this section—

"(1) The term 'document' includes registry and enrollment and license;

"(2) The term 'documented' means registered or enrolled or licensed under the laws of the United States whether permanently or temporarily;

"(3) The term 'port of documentation' means the port at which the vessel is documented in accordance with law;

"(4) The term 'vessel of the United States' means any vessel documented under the laws of the United States and such vessel shall be held to continue to be so documented until its documents are surrendered with the approval of the board; and

"(5) The term 'mortgagee' in the case of a mortgage involving a trust deed and a bond issue thereunder means the trustee designated in such deed.

"RECORDING OF SALES, CONVEYANCES, AND MORTGAGES OF VESSELS OF THE UNITED STATES."

"SUBSEC. C. (a) No sale, conveyance, or mortgage which, at the time such sale, conveyance, or mortgage is made includes a vessel of the United States or any portion thereof, as the whole or any part of the property sold, conveyed, or mortgaged shall be valid, in respect to such vessel, against any person other than the grantor or mortgagor, his heir or devisee, and a person having actual notice thereof, until such bill of sale, conveyance, or mortgage is recorded in the office of the collector of customs of the port of documentation of such vessel as provided in subdivision (b) of this subsection.

"(b) Such collector of customs shall record bills of sale, conveyances, and mortgages, delivered to him, in the order of their reception, in books to be kept for that purpose and indexed to show—

"(1) The name of the vessel;

"(2) The names of the parties to the sale, conveyance, or mortgage;

"(3) The time and date of reception of the instrument;

"(4) The interest in the vessel so sold, conveyed, or mortgaged; and

"(5) The amount and date of maturity of the mortgage.

"SUBSEC. D. (a) A valid mortgage which, at the time it is made includes the whole of any vessel of the United States of 200 gross tons and upward, shall in addition have, in respect to such vessel and as of the date of the compliance with all the provisions of this subdivision, the preferred status given by the provisions of subsection M, if—

"(1) The mortgage is indorsed upon the vessel's documents in accordance with the provisions of this section;

"(2) The mortgage is recorded as provided in subsection C, together with the time and date when the mortgage is so indorsed;

"(3) An affidavit is filed with the record of such mortgage to the effect that the mortgage is made in good faith and without any design to hinder, delay, or defraud any existing or future creditor of the mortgagor or any lienor of the mortgaged vessel;

"(4) The mortgage does not stipulate that the mortgagee waives the preferred status thereof; and

"(5) The mortgagee is a citizen of the United States.

"(b) Any mortgage which complies in respect to any vessel with the conditions enumerated in this subsection is hereafter in this section called a 'preferred mortgage' as to such vessel.

"(c) There shall be indorsed upon the documents of a vessel covered by a preferred mortgage—

"(1) The names of the mortgagor and mortgagee;

"(2) The time and date the indorsement is made;

"(3) The amount and date of maturity of the mortgage; and

"(4) Any amount required to be indorsed by the provisions of subdivision (e) or (f) of this subsection.

"(d) Such indorsement shall be made (1) by the collector of customs of the port of documentation of the mortgaged vessel, or (2) by the collector of customs of any port in which the vessel is found, if such collector is directed to make the indorsement by the collector of customs of the port of documentation; and no clearance shall be issued to the vessel until such in-

dorsement is made. The collector of customs of the port of documentation shall give such direction by wire or letter at the request of the mortgagee and upon the tender of the cost of communication of such direction. Whenever any new document is issued for the vessel, such indorsement shall be transferred to and indorsed upon the new document by the collector of customs.

"(e) A mortgage which includes property other than a vessel shall not be held a preferred mortgage unless the mortgage provides for the separate discharge of such property by the payment of a specified portion of the mortgage indebtedness. If a preferred mortgage so provides for the separate discharge, the amount of the portion of such payment shall be indorsed upon the documents of the vessel.

"(f) If a preferred mortgage includes more than one vessel and provides for the separate discharge of each vessel by the payment of a portion of the mortgage indebtedness, the amount of such portion of such payment shall be indorsed upon the documents of the vessel. In case such mortgage does not provide for the separate discharge of a vessel and the vessel is to be sold upon the order of a district court of the United States in a suit in rem in admiralty, the court shall determine the portion of the mortgage indebtedness increased by 20 per cent (1) which, in the opinion of the court, the approximate value of the vessel bears to the approximate value of all the vessels covered by the mortgage, and (2) upon the payment of which the vessel shall be discharged from the mortgage.

"SUBSEC. E. The collector of customs upon the recording of a preferred mortgage shall deliver two certified copies thereof to the mortgagor who shall place, and use due diligence to retain, one copy on board the mortgaged vessel and cause such copy and the documents of the vessel to be exhibited by the master to any person having business with the vessel, which may give rise to a maritime lien upon the vessel or to the sale, conveyance, or mortgage thereof. The master of the vessel shall, upon the request of any such person, exhibit to him the documents of the vessel and the copy of any preferred mortgage of the vessel placed on board thereof.

"SUBSEC. F. The mortgagor (1) shall, upon request of the mortgagee, disclose in writing to him prior to the execution of any preferred mortgage, the existence of any maritime lien, prior mortgage, or other obligation or liability upon the vessel to be mortgaged, that is known to the mortgagor, and (2), without the consent of the mortgagee, shall not incur, after the execution of such mortgage and before the mortgagee has had a reasonable time in which to record the mortgage and have indorsements in respect thereto made upon the documents of the vessel, any contractual obligation creating a lien upon the vessel other than a lien for wages of stevedores when employed directly by the owner, operator, master, ship's husband, or agent of the vessel, for wages of the crew of the vessel, for general average, or for salvage, including contract salvage, in respect to the vessel.

"SUBSEC. G. (a) The collector of customs of the port of documentation shall, upon the request of any person, record notice of his claim of a lien upon a vessel covered by a preferred mortgage, together with the nature, date of creation, and amount of the lien, and the name and address of the person. Any person who has caused notice of his claim of lien to be so recorded shall, upon a discharge in whole or in part of the indebtedness, forthwith file with the collector of customs a certificate of such discharge. The collector of customs shall thereupon record the certificate.

"(b) The mortgagor, upon a discharge in whole or in part of the mortgage indebtedness, shall forthwith file with the collector of customs for the port of documentation of the vessel, a certificate of such discharge. Such collector of customs shall thereupon record the certificate. In case of a vessel covered by a preferred mortgage, the collector of customs at the port of documentation shall (1) indorse upon the documents of the vessel, or direct the collector of customs at any port in which the vessel is found to so indorse the fact of such discharge, and (2) shall deny clearance to the vessel until such indorsement is made.

"SUBSEC. H. (a) No bill of sale, conveyance, or mortgage shall be recorded unless it states the interest of the grantor or mortgagor in the vessel, and the interest so sold, conveyed, or mortgaged.

"(b) No bill of sale, conveyance, mortgage, notice of claim of lien, or certificate of discharge thereof, shall be recorded unless previously acknowledged before a notary public or other officer authorized by a law of the United States, or of a State, Territory, District, or possession thereof, to take acknowledgment of deeds.

"(c) In case of a change in the port of documentation of a vessel of the United States, no bill of sale, conveyance, or mort-



gage shall be recorded at the new port of documentation unless there is furnished to the collector of customs of such port, together with the copy of the bill of sale, conveyance, or mortgage to be recorded, a certified copy of the record of the vessel at the former port of documentation furnished by the collector of such port. The collector of customs at the new port of documentation is authorized and directed to record such certified copy.

"(d) A preferred mortgage may bear such rate of interest as is agreed by the parties thereto.

"SUBSEC. I. Each collector of customs shall permit records made under the provisions of this section to be inspected during office hours, under such reasonable regulations as the collector may establish. Upon the request of any person the collector of customs shall furnish him from the records of the collector's office (1) a certificate setting forth the names of the owners of any vessel, the interest held by each owner, and the material facts as to any bill of sale or conveyance of, any mortgage covering, or any lien or other incumbrance upon a specified vessel, (2) a certified copy of any bill of sale, conveyance, mortgage, notice of claim of lien, or certificate of discharge in respect to such vessel, or (3) a certified copy as required by subdivision (c) of subsection H. The collector of customs shall collect a fee for any bill of sale, conveyance, or mortgage recorded, or any certificate or certified copy furnished, by him, in the amount of 20 cents a folio with a minimum charge of \$1. All such fees shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

#### "PENALTIES.

"SUBSEC. J. (a) If the master of the vessel willfully fails to exhibit the documents of the vessel or the copy of any preferred mortgage thereof, as required by subsection E, the board of local inspectors of vessels having jurisdiction of the license of the master, may suspend or cancel such license, subject to the provisions of 'An act to provide for appeals from decision of boards of local inspectors of vessels, and for other purposes,' approved June 10, 1918.

"(b) A mortgagor who, with intent to defraud, violates any provision of subsection F, and if the mortgagor is a corporation or association, the president or other principal executive officer of the corporation or association, shall upon conviction thereof be held guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both. The mortgaged indebtedness shall thereupon become immediately due and payable at the election of the mortgagee.

"(c) If any person enters into any contract secured by, or upon the credit of, a vessel of the United States covered by a preferred mortgage, and suffers pecuniary loss by reason of the failure of the collector of customs, or any officer, employee, or agent thereof, properly to perform any duty required of the collector under the provisions of this section, the collector of customs shall be liable to such person for damages in the amount of such loss. If any such person is caused any such loss by reason of the failure of the mortgagor, or master of the mortgaged vessel, or any officer, employee, or agent thereof, to comply with any provision of subsection E or F or to file an affidavit as required by subdivision (a) of subsection D, correct in each particular thereof, the mortgagor shall be liable to such person for damages in the amount of such loss. The district courts of the United States are given jurisdiction (but not to the exclusion of the courts of the several States, Territories, Districts, or possessions) of suits for the recovery of such damages, irrespective of the amount involved in the suit or the citizenship of the parties thereto. Such suit shall be begun by personal service upon the defendant within the limits of the district. Upon judgment for the plaintiff in any such suit, the court shall include in the judgment an additional amount for costs of the action and a reasonable counsel's fee, to be fixed by the court.

#### "FORECLOSURE OF PREFERRED MORTGAGES.

"SUBSEC. K. A preferred mortgage shall constitute a lien upon the mortgaged vessel in the amount of the outstanding mortgage indebtedness secured by such vessel. Upon the default of any term or condition of the mortgage, such lien may be enforced by the mortgagee by suit in rem in admiralty. Original jurisdiction of all such suits is granted to the district courts of the United States exclusively. In addition to any notice by publication, actual notice of the commencement of any such suit shall be given by the libellant, in such manner as the court shall direct, to (1) the master, other ranking officer, or caretaker of the vessel, and (2) any person who has recorded a notice of claim of an undischarged lien upon the vessel, as provided in subsection G, unless after search by the libellant satisfactory to the court, such mortgagor, master, other ranking officer, caretaker, or claimant is not found within the United

States. Failure to give notice to any such person, as required by this subsection, shall not constitute a jurisdictional defect; but the libellant shall be liable to such person for damages in the amount of his interest in the vessel terminated by the suit. Suit in personam for the recovery of such damages may be brought in accordance with the provisions of subdivision (c) of section 10.

"SUBSEC. L. In any suit in rem in admiralty for the enforcement of the preferred mortgage lien, the court may appoint a receiver and, in its discretion, authorize the receiver to operate the mortgaged vessel. The marshal may be authorized and directed by the court to take possession of the mortgaged vessel notwithstanding the fact that the vessel is in the possession or under the control of any person claiming a possessory common-law lien.

"SUBSEC. M. (a) When used hereinafter in this section, the term 'preferred maritime lien' means (1) a lien arising prior in time to the recording and indorsement of a preferred mortgage in accordance with the provisions of this section; or (2) a lien for damages arising out of tort, for wages of a stevedore when employed directly by the owner, operator, master, ship's husband, or agent of the vessel, for wages of the crew of the vessel, for general average, and for salvage, including contract salvage.

"(b) Upon the sale of any mortgaged vessel by order of a district court of the United States in any suit in rem in admiralty for the enforcement of a preferred mortgage lien thereon, all preexisting claims in the vessel, including any possessory common-law lien of which a lienor is deprived under the provisions of subsection L shall be held terminated and shall thereafter attach, in like amount and in accordance with their respective priorities, to the proceeds of the sale; except that the preferred mortgage lien shall have priority over all claims against the vessel, except (1) preferred maritime liens, and (2) expenses and fees allowed and costs taxed, by the court.

"SUBSEC. N. (a) Upon the default of any term or condition of a preferred mortgage upon a vessel, the mortgagee may, in addition to all other remedies granted by this section, bring suit in personam in admiralty in a district court of the United States, against the mortgagor for the amount of the outstanding mortgage indebtedness secured by such vessel or any deficiency in the full payment thereof.

"(b) This section shall not be construed, in the case of a mortgage covering, in addition to vessels, realty or personality other than vessels, or both, to authorize the enforcement by suit in rem in admiralty of the rights of the mortgagee in respect to such realty or personality other than vessels.

#### "TRANSFERS OF MORTGAGED VESSELS AND ASSIGNMENT OF VESSEL MORTGAGES.

"SUBSEC. O. (a) The documents of a vessel of the United States covered by a preferred mortgage may not be surrendered (except in the case of the forfeiture of the vessel or its sale by the order of any court of the United States or any foreign country) without the approval of the board. The board shall refuse such approval unless the mortgagee consents to such surrender.

"(b) The interest of the mortgagee in a vessel of the United States covered by a mortgage, shall not be terminated by the forfeiture of the vessel for a violation of any law of the United States, unless the mortgage authorized, consented, or conspired to effect the illegal act, failure, or omission which constituted such violation.

"(c) Upon the sale of any vessel of the United States covered by a preferred mortgage, by order of a district court of the United States in any suit in rem in admiralty for the enforcement of a maritime lien other than a preferred maritime lien, the vessel shall be sold free from all preexisting claims thereon; but the court shall, upon the request of the mortgagee, the libellant, or any intervenor, require the purchaser at such sale to give and the mortgagor to accept a new mortgage of the vessel for the balance of the term of the original mortgage. The conditions of such new mortgage shall be the same, so far as practicable, as those of the original mortgage and shall be subject to the approval of the court. If such new mortgage is given, the mortgagee shall not be paid from the proceeds of the sale and the amount payable as the purchase price shall be held diminished in the amount of the new mortgage indebtedness.

"(d) No rights under a mortgage of a vessel of the United States shall be assigned to any person not a citizen of the United States without the approval of the board. Any assignment in violation of any provision of this section shall be void.

"(e) No vessel of the United States shall be sold by order of a district court of the United States in any suit in rem in admiralty to any person not a citizen of the United States.



## "MARITIME LIENS FOR NECESSARIES."

"SUBSEC. P. Any person furnishing repairs, supplies, towage, use of dry dock or marine railway, or other necessities, to any vessel, whether foreign or domestic, upon the order of the owner of such vessel, or of a person authorized by the owner, shall have a maritime lien on the vessel, which may be enforced by suit in rem, and it shall not be necessary to allege or prove that credit was given to the vessel.

"SUBSEC. Q. The following persons shall be presumed to have authority from the owner to procure repairs, supplies, towage, use of dry dock or marine railway, and other necessities for the vessel: The managing owner, ship's husband, master, or any person to whom the management of the vessel at the port of supply is intrusted. No person tortiously or unlawfully in possession or charge of a vessel shall have authority to bind the vessel.

"SUBSEC. R. The officers and agents of a vessel specified in subsection Q shall be taken to include such officers and agents when appointed by a charterer, by an owner pro hac vice, or by an agreed purchaser in possession of the vessel; but nothing in this section shall be construed to confer a lien when the furnisher knew, or by exercise of reasonable diligence could have ascertained, that because of the terms of a charter party, agreement for sale of the vessel, or for any other reason, the person ordering the repairs, supplies, or other necessities was without authority to bind the vessel therefor.

"SUBSEC. S. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the furnisher of repairs, supplies, towage, use of dry dock or marine railway, or other necessities, or the mortgagee, from waiving his right to a lien, or in the case of a preferred mortgage lien, to the preferred status of such lien, at any time, by agreement or otherwise; and this section shall not be construed to affect the rules of law now existing in regard to (1) the right to proceed against the vessel for advances, (2) laches in the enforcement of liens upon vessels, (3) the right to proceed in personam, (4) the rank of preferred maritime liens among themselves, or (5) priorities between maritime liens and mortgages, other than preferred mortgages, upon vessels of the United States.

"SUBSEC. T. This section shall supersede the provisions of all State statutes conferring liens on vessels, in so far as such statutes purport to create rights of action to be enforced by suits in rem in admiralty against vessels for repairs, supplies, towage, use of dry dock or marine railway, and other necessities.

## "MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS."

"SUBSEC. U. This section shall not apply (1) to any existing mortgage, or (2) to any mortgage hereafter placed on any vessel now under an existing mortgage, so long as such existing mortgage remains undischarged.

"SUBSEC. V. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to furnish collectors of customs with all necessary books and records, and with certificates of registry and of enrollment and license in such form as provides for the making of all indorsements thereon required by this section.

"SUBSEC. W. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make such regulations in respect to the recording and indorsing of mortgages covering vessels of the United States as he deems necessary to the efficient execution of the provisions of this section.

"SUBSEC. X. Sections 4192 to 4196, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, and the act entitled 'An act relating to liens on vessels for repairs, supplies, or other necessities,' approved June 23, 1910, are repealed. This section, however, so far as not inconsistent with any of the provisions of law so repealed, shall be held a reenactment of such repealed law, and any right or obligation based upon any provision of such law and accruing prior to such repeal, may be prosecuted in the same manner and to the same effect as if this act had not been passed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 33" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 31"; in lines 8 and 9 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the words "or take in fuel"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the figure "11" and insert in lieu the figure "10" and change the section number from "34" to "32"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139, and agree to the same with

an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Jurisdiction in such actions shall be under the court of the district in which the defendant employer resides or in which his principal office is located"; in line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the section number "36" and insert in lieu thereof the number "33"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment change the section number from "37" to "34"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "35"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "specifically"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the section number "39" and insert in lieu thereof the number "36"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 145, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment change the period to a semicolon and add the following: "the term 'board' means the United States Shipping Board; and the term 'alien' means any person not a citizen of the United States"; also change the section number in line 1 from "40" to "37"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 38. That section 2 of the shipping act, 1916, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. (a) That within the meaning of this act no corporation, partnership, or association shall be deemed a citizen of the United States unless the controlling interest therein is owned by citizens of the United States, and, in the case of a corporation, unless its president and managing directors are citizens of the United States and the corporation itself is organized under the laws of the United States or of a State, Territory, District, or possession thereof; but in the case of a corporation, association, or partnership operating any vessel in the coastwise trade the amount of interest required to be owned by citizens of the United States shall be 75 per cent.

"(b) The controlling interest in a corporation shall not be deemed to be owned by citizens of the United States (a) if the title to a majority of the stock thereof is not vested in such citizens free from any trust or fiduciary obligation in favor of any person not a citizen of the United States; or (b) if the majority of the voting power in such corporation is not vested in citizens of the United States; or (c) if through any contract or understanding it is so arranged that the majority of the voting power may be exercised, directly or indirectly, in behalf of any person who is not a citizen of the United States; or (d) if by any other means whatsoever control of the corporation is conferred upon or permitted to be exercised by any person who is not a citizen of the United States.

"(c) Seventy-five per cent of the interest in a corporation shall not be deemed to be owned by citizens of the United States (a) if the title to 75 per cent of its stock is not vested in such citizens free from any trust or fiduciary obligation in favor of any person not a citizen of the United States; or (b) if 75 per cent of the voting power in such corporation is not vested in citizens of the United States; or (c) if, through any contract or understanding it is so arranged that more than 25 per cent of the voting power in such corporation may be exercised directly or indirectly, in behalf of any person who is not a citizen of the United States; or (d) if by any other means whatsoever control of any interest in the corporation in excess of 25 per cent is conferred upon or permitted to be exercised by any person who is not a citizen of the United States.

"(d) The provisions of this act shall apply to receivers and trustees of all persons to whom the act applies, and to the successors or assignees of such persons."

And the Senate agree to the same.



That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "39"; and the Senate agree to the same.

W. L. JONES,  
WILLIAM M. CALDER,  
CHAS. L. McNARY,  
JOS. E. RANDELL,  
F. M. SIMMONS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

WILLIAM S. GREENE,  
G. W. EDMONDS,  
FREDERICK W. ROWE,  
RUFUS HARDY,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not understand what we struck out. I can not get it in my mind.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I can state to the Senator what has been done.

We had in our bill a provision with reference to exemption from income taxes for the purpose of aiding in the construction of ships. When the conferees met we reached an agreement on that matter, and then the drafting experts suggested that it ought to be redrafted in conjunction with the Treasury experts. This was done, and we inserted a provision, as they drew it, embodying the idea that passed the Senate. It went to the House, and on account of some provision in the section as drafted by the experts a point of order was sustained to this provision. Now, it has come back to conference, and we have adopted the language of the Senate provision as it passed the Senate, so that that makes it conform to the action of the Senate.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. NUGENT. Do I understand that the conference committee has cut out the two paragraphs of section 25 relieving shipowners from the operation of the tax laws?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Section 25, amendment numbered 128 as it was passed through the Senate, provided for the exemption for 10 years, as the Senator remembers, and so forth; and then the last paragraph also provided for the determination of depreciation. As I said, when we got into conference we agreed upon these three provisions with certain minor amendments, mere verbal amendments.

Then the drafting experts said that, while they had no objection to the idea, it should be put in a little different language, and they drew a provision embodying our idea. It went over to the House, and a point of order was made to it, on the ground that it was broader than the Senate provision, and that point of order was sustained. Now the bill has come back to conference, and we accept and they accept the first two paragraphs in the language of the Senate as the Senate passed it. We went further, however, and struck out the third paragraph of the Senate amendment entirely; so that we have taken two paragraphs of the Senate amendment as the Senate passed it, simply confirming the action of the Senate on those two paragraphs without change.

Mr. REED. Then, Mr. President, as I understand the Senator, there remains in the bill this language:

SEC. 25. That the owner of a vessel documented under the laws of the United States and operated in foreign trade shall, for each of the 10 taxable years while so operated, beginning with the first taxable year ending after the enactment of this act, be allowed as a deduction, for the purpose of ascertaining his net income subject to the war-profits and excess-profits taxes imposed by Title III of the revenue act of 1918, an amount equivalent to the net earnings of such vessel during such taxable year, determined in accordance with rules and regulations to be made by the board: *Provided, however—*

And so forth. So that, as I understand the provision—and the Senator will correct me if I am wrong—that exempts the earnings of these vessels from the taxation which the rest of the people of the United States have to pay.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It does this: It exempts those sums as tax payments, provided they invest that money in new ships of the type required by the board and to be approved by the board; and I will say to the Senator that that has passed the Senate twice.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was in the last conference report in a different wording. Now, we assumed, of course, that this provision having been adopted by the Senate, and the House receding and agreeing to the provision of the Senate, there

would be no controversy even on the part of those who might be opposed to the proposition.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, some of us have been too busy working on committees, performing work which was imperative, to give to this bill the attention which its importance demanded.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I appreciate that.

Mr. REED. So far as I am concerned, I am utterly opposed on principle to exempting any class of citizens from taxation or any class of investments from taxation, unless it be those citizens who have very small incomes or those investments which are of an educational, a charitable, or religious character. I can not understand the justification for exempting from taxation the corporate owner of a ship. It does not have any income taxes to pay unless it has a net income. Unless it makes profits it does not have to pay taxes. If it does make profits it ought to pay taxes, like other people.

The proposition that it shall invest the amount in other ships is exactly the equivalent of a proposition to a steel manufacturing corporation that it shall be exempt from taxation on its profits provided it will build another steel mill, or to a farmer that he shall be exempt from taxation provided he will buy another farm, or to a banker that he shall be exempt from taxation provided he will establish another bank, or to a bond dealer that he shall be exempt from taxation provided he will take his profits and buy more bonds. Why, this artifice is as old as human cupidity and as crooked as dishonesty has been from the first. It has been tried out 10,000 times on 10,000 different things.

The commonest device of the gentleman wanting to locate a factory is to say that he will establish it provided he is exempted from taxation. In many of the States of this Union that custom of exempting such industries at one time prevailed, and in many instances the courts declared the laws exempting these institutions from taxation to be unconstitutional.

Now, we drag out of the closet of the past this old, discredited specter of fraud, of fraud against the Government and the people and of discrimination in favor of the rich. We attach it here to a bill that proposes to give to those who want to engage in carrying upon the seas more privileges and more advantages than have ever been granted by this Government in any bill that has been passed in recent years.

What is this proposition, stripped naked?

We want to build up a merchant marine. That is a most laudable purpose. The Government, at the expense of billions of money, in time of war, forced on by necessity, built a great number of vessels and established a great number of shipyards. It is now proposed to sell or charter these ships to private parties. That they will be sold to private parties under advantageous conditions goes without saying. We have already had some evidence that contracts were made for the disposal of certain of the vessels which we had either acquired in the war or had built under circumstances so grossly fraudulent, so infamously wrong and wicked that the courts, at the suit of a private citizen—Mr. Hearst—enjoined the transaction. The particular gentleman responsible for that policy was promoted to a higher position, which he now holds. I do not know how far the personnel of the board remains the same, but I do know that the old policy, the old theory, the old impelling motives which have always led the average man to regard the Federal Government as a great goose, existing only for the purpose of having its feathers regularly plucked, those same motives and policies will exist in the future. I do know that every time Uncle Sam engages in a business deal his pockets are picked in broad daylight.

We have had some experience with the difference between the patriotism of the soldier on the field of battle and the Army contractor. In the height of the war, when we were massing our troops upon the front, when the sky above them was literally obscured by the enemy airplanes, not only spying upon their movements and indicating their location to the German artillery, but raining upon them deadly missiles from the heavens, we beheld the spectacle of a billion and a quarter of our money squandered by the dollar-a-year patriots in constructing aircraft which were described by the men who had to use them as "flying coffins." Even when Uncle Sam stood with his bared breast in front of the blazing German cannon, these men did not hesitate to profiteer. That is the difference between money patriotism and human patriotism.

So I say, when you undertake to put somebody here to guard the interests of this Government in the sale of these ships to private parties, you will find out in the long run that the private corporations, working by day and by night, working through the silent influences they employ, will get these vessels on very favorable terms. It is proposed, in addition to that, to exempt them, and them alone of all the capitalists in the United States,

from taxation, a taxation, mark you, upon profits, for they have no taxes to pay unless they make profits. If their profits are low their taxes will be low, and it is only when their profits are high that their taxes will be high.

Mr. President, we had better wait a long time and rewrite a bill of this sort. We can much better afford to wait until next December and rewrite this bill than to pass it now and fasten it upon the American people.

I want to see a merchant marine established. We have a merchant marine. We built it out of the people's money. All that is necessary to do to put the American flag on the ocean and to have it waving in the breezes of every harbor of every sea is for the United States to employ plain business common sense and create a board to operate the ships, and, if desirable, charter them, in whole or in part, to private companies.

There is to be exemption from taxation for ship-owning capitalists upon the profits they have garnered and the gold they have gotten, while the hand of the taxgatherer is laid upon the meager salary of a woman who earns above \$1,000 a year; upon the laborer who earns above \$1,000; that is the exemption limit.

Mr. SIMMONS. A thousand dollars for a single person.

Mr. REED. Yes; a thousand for a single person and two thousand for a married person—a salary which will not support two people in a city, let alone support a man with a wife and three or four or five children.

We lay our hand upon his income, and we tax him; but it is proposed that the big ship company, with a capital running into the millions of dollars, shall not pay a tax on its profits, and we are practically to finance them to start with by furnishing the ships on favorable terms.

We levy a tax on the salary of the minister, on the salary of the school-teacher, upon the little income of the widow, upon the patrimony of the orphan, upon the farmer, upon the truck gardener, upon everybody. They have not asked exemption. Only this thing called the shipping patriot asks it. It has been asking at the doors of Congress for many years. All that time it has been standing here demanding a ship subsidy. We have had coastwise laws passed which enable those in the coastwise trade to build up a monopoly and to charge extortionate rates. This bill, in addition to the proposition I am now discussing, extends those laws, and carries the monopoly across 6,000 miles of the Pacific Ocean and attaches it to the Philippines.

Mr. President, a bill like this ought to be rewritten. As far as I am concerned, I do not intend to stand here and talk until 4 o'clock to-morrow to defeat it, for there are other measures which must be considered; but against its acceptance I protest with every sentiment of my heart and with every energy I possess. I venture the prediction that when the American people understand that great shipping companies, which have already been trying to rob this country, and been convicted of it in the courts of the land, and the convictions solemnly entered on record as a permanent injunction—there will be an answer, sir, which will be heard throughout the country.

Mr. President, I apologize for taking so much time at this late hour of the session. I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report, on which the yeas and nays are requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GAY. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. HENDERSON. Notwithstanding my pair, I am at liberty to vote on this question. I vote "yea."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], who is absent at this time, but he would vote as I have voted, and I therefore let my vote stand.

Mr. SPENCER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], but under the arrangement I have with him I will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsyl-

vania [Mr. KNOX], but I am informed that he would vote as I have voted, and I will let my vote stand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 11, as follows:

## YEAS—34.

Brandegge	Henderson	Page	Smoot
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Spencer
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Phipps	Sutherland
Curtis	Keyes	Pittman	Thomas
Dial	Lodge	Pomerene	Townsend
Dillingham	McKellar	Ransdell	Underwood
Fernald	McNary	Robinson	Warren
Gay	Nelson	Simmons	
Gerry	New	Smith, Md.	

## NAYS—11.

Borah	Harrison	Norris	Sheppard
Capper	Kenyon	Nugent	Walsh, Mass.
Harris	King	Reed	

## NOT VOTING—51.

Ashurst	Glass	Lenroot	Smith, Ariz.
Ball	Gore	McCormick	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Gronna	McCumber	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Hale	McLean	Stanley
Comer	Harding	Moses	Sterling
Culbertson	Hitchcock	Myers	Swanson
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Trammell
Edge	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Wadsworth
Elkins	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	Kellogg	Penrose	Watson
Fletcher	King	Polindexter	Williams
France	Knox	Sherman	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Shields	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it is perfectly manifest that it will take an hour or two hours to get Senators here, because they have gone to dinner. I suggest the propriety of either a recess or an adjournment until 8 o'clock.

Mr. JONES of Washington. May I suggest to the Senator that it is very important that the conference report should go over to the House to-night? I do not think it will take long to get a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Harris	New	Smith, Md.
Brandegge	Harrison	Norris	Spencer
Calder	Henderson	Nugent	Sterling
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Page	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Phipps	Thomas
Curtis	Kenyon	Pittman	Townsend
Dial	Keyes	Pomerene	Underwood
Dillingham	King	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	Lodge	Reed	Warren
Gay	McKellar	Robinson	
Gerry	McNary	Sheppard	
Glass	Nelson	Simmons	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the order of the Senate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Should not the call of the names of absent Senators proceed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order has already been agreed to directing the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. LODGE. I thought it would save time not to have the second call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The usual custom is to call the names of absent Senators, but that has not been done in this instance. It is competent for the Senate to pursue the other course.

Mr. STANLEY, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. FALL, and Mr. PHELAN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. Upon that question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and vote "yea."



Mr. GAY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] which I transfer to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called.) The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent, and I agreed to pair with him while he is away. Understanding that he would vote the same as I would on this conference report, I vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]. I understand if he were present he would vote as I shall, and I therefore vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and I vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. Upon a vote on this question this morning that Senator voted as I did, and therefore I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SPENCER. Making the same announcement as before with regard to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], which I transfer to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. COMER] and vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. I will therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]; and

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I inquire if the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have a general pair with that Senator, and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 11, as follows:

#### YEAS—40.

Brandegge	Glass	McNary	Simmons
Calder	Hale	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Harding	New	Spencer
Curtis	Henderson	Page	Stanley
Dial	Hitchcock	Phelan	Sterling
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Sutherland
Fall	Kendrick	Pittman	Thomas
Fernald	Keyes	Pomerene	Townsend
Gay	Lodge	Ransdell	Underwood
Gerry	McKellar	Robinson	Warren

#### NAYS—11.

Borah	Harrison	Norris	Trammell
Capper	Kenyon	Nugent	Walsh, Mass.
Harris	King	Sheppard	

#### NOT VOTING—45.

Ashurst	Edge	Johnson, Calif.	Lenroot
Ball	Elkins	Johnson, S. Dak.	McCormick
Beckham	Fletcher	Jones, N. Mex.	McCumber
Colt	France	Kellogg	McLean
Comer	Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Moses
Culbertson	Gore	Knox	Myers
Cummins	Gronna	La Follette	Newberry

Oberman	Sherman	Smoot	Williams
Owen	Shields	Swanson	Wolcott
Penrose	Smith, Ariz.	Wadsworth	
Poinexter	Smith, Ga.	Walsh, Mont.	
Reed	Smith, S. C.	Watson	

So the conference report was agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I find that the work on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate is such that I can not be on the floor of the Senate and attend to the work in the committee; it is too engrossing; and it will be more so next winter. Now, that on the final appropriation bill for this session the conferees are ready to report, I wish to tender to the Senate my resignation as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and request that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] shall be appointed to fill the vacancy created by my resignation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama asks to be relieved from the discharge of further duties as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senator from Alabama further asks that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] be placed upon the Committee on Appropriations to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of the Senator from Alabama. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 3270. An act authorizing the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine claims for damages occasioned by acts for which said survey is responsible in certain cases;

S. 4167. An act to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge approaches, and extensions or additions thereto, by the city of St. Louis, within the States of Illinois and Missouri; and

S. 4435. An act to authorize officers of the naval service to accept offices with compensation and emoluments from Governments of the Republics of South America.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 643) to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14338) to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 12530) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

#### RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. TOWNSEND submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14338) to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 9.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, 6, 7, and 10, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "125" named in said amendment insert the following: "120"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate insert the following: "When the amount exceeds \$100 for any one quarter, the postmaster shall be allowed—on the

first \$100, 115 per cent; on the next \$100 or less 75 per cent; and on the balance 60 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "60" named in said amendment insert the following: "50"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended paragraph insert the following:

"Inspectors shall be paid their actual expenses not to exceed \$5 per day while engaged on official business away from their homes and official domiciles. The appropriations for per diem allowance authorized for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1920, may be utilized for such expenses."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHAS. E. TOWNSEND,  
THOMAS STERLING,  
J. C. W. BECKHAM,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

H. STEENERSON,  
MARTIN B. MADDEN,  
JOHN A. MOON,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. TOWNSEND. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRISON. Reserving the right to object, I reserve any points of order on the report. I want to ask the Senator from Michigan touching an amendment—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, if the report is to lead to any debate—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understood, when I made the request, that if there was any debate the matter could go over.

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. The Senate has now been here until 7 o'clock, and I think an opportunity ought to be given to those Senators, at least, who have remained to get something to eat. I therefore move that the Senate take a recess until 8.30 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m., Friday, June 4, 1920) the Senate took a recess until 8 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

#### EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8.30 o'clock p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

#### PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3747.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, let us find out what the bill is.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is a pension bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3747) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I desire to say that there are five of these bills upon the calendar which deal with pensions for those in the Regular Establishment and in wars other than the Civil War. They have been upon the calendar for several months. I have held them in abeyance until after the passage of the Sells bill, which would take care of about one-half of the cases included in these bills. Therefore, with the consent of the committee, I shall move committee amendments whereby all of the items in each one of the bills which are taken care of by the Sells bill will be eliminated. That will eliminate about one-half of the items in the five bills.

I desire to say to Senators, before proceeding with them, that there is very little involved in each bill in the way of expense. The first one will carry about \$20,000; the second one, about \$10,000; the third, about \$15,000; the fourth, about \$9,000; and the fifth one, about \$9,000; there being less than \$60,000 involved in the five bills.

I send to the desk the amendments to Senate bill 3747, in which I have eliminated all of those covered by the Sells bill; and I move them as a single amendment, if there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill has not been read. There is no order for the consideration of committee amendments first.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will state the amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota in behalf of the committee.

The amendments were, on page 2, to strike out lines 1 to 15, inclusive, as follows:

The name of William J. Grimm, late of Company G, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Hawkins, late of the United States Marine Corps, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Provencher, Jr., late of Company G, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John H. Helser, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

On the same page, strike out lines 20 to 23, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Sanford S. See, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

On the same page, strike out lines 24 and 25, and on page 3, strike out line 1 to 25, inclusive, as follows:

The name of David A. Kooker, late of Company I, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Engineers, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry F. Baldwin, late first lieutenant Company A, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Robert L. Zell, late of Company I, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George F. Thomas, late ensign, United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John F. Buckley, late of Company L, Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jasper M. Sweeney, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter White, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

On page 4, strike out lines 1 to 3, inclusive, as follows:

The name of James W. Wilson, late of Company L, Twentieth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

On the same page, strike out lines 8 to 16, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Jennie Y. Featherston, widow of Charles R. Featherston, late of Company B, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles D. Tibbets, late of Company B, First Regiment Virginia Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

On the same page, strike out lines 21 to 24, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Patrick G. Conley, late of Battery A, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

On page 5, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive, as follows:

The name of George E. Noblet, late of Company L, First Territorial Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

On the same page, strike out lines 15 to 25, inclusive, as follows:

The name of John D. Harkless, late second lieutenant Company F, Twenty-third Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of John W. Ferris, late chaplain, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John D. Ball, late of Company B and band, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

On page 6, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Harry McFarlin, late second lieutenant Company K, First Regiment Florida Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.



On the same page, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive, as follows:

The name of John Fullam, late of Company G, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

On page 7, strike out lines 5 to 9, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Annie K. Stearns, widow of Joshua B. Stearns, late midshipman United States frigate *Constitution*, United States Navy, War of 1812, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

On the same page, strike out lines 19 to 23, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Margaret A. Roberts, widow of John Roberts, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

On page 8, strike out lines 4 to 10, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Leonardo S. Twisten, late of Company L, Forty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Enoch E. Willard, late of Company B, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

On the same page, strike out lines 16 to 18, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Anton Casper, late of Company B, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

On page 8, strike out lines 23 to 25, and on page 9, strike out lines 1 to 6, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Elizabeth Teague, widow of Abner W. Teague, late of Company A, First Regiment Mississippi Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emmett W. Fitzsimmons, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

On page 9, strike out lines 23 to 25, inclusive, as follows:

The name of George Wortser, late of Company E, First Regiment South Dakota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

On page 10, strike out lines 1 to 7, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Jesse E. Ballinger, late of Troop A, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Hiram A. Campbell, late of Company H, Forty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

On the same page, strike out lines 17 to 24, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Mary A. C. Kaigler, widow of William Kaigler, late of Company D, First Regiment Georgia Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James R. Sullivan, late of Company M, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

On page 11, strike out lines 16 to 25, and on page 12, strike out lines 1 to 11, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Harley Mowrey, late of Company C, Mormon Battalion Iowa Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elmer Bjarnson, late of Battery B, Utah Volunteer Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Wheeler, late of Troop L, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George B. Taylor, late of Company C, First Regiment Wyoming Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ruth E. Hartfiel, widow of Ray Hartfiel, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Ray Hartfiel until they reach the age of 16 years.

On page 12, strike out lines 20 to 23, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Howard G. Cleaveland, late of Company G, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

On page 13, strike out lines 3 to 5, inclusive, as follows:

The name of James Martin, late of Company B, First Regiment Montana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

On the same page, strike out lines 11 to 14, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Duff Herrington, late of Company E, Twenty-third Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

On page 14, strike out lines 5 to 12, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Wesley H. Dick, late of Company B, Thirty-fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles M. Woodworth, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, in view of the numerous pension bills which we have passed, as well as the Fuller bill, which is so general in its terms, what is the necessity of this bill and to what particular class of persons does it apply?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator was not in the Chamber when I explained that the bills that are included in the five bills that are now on the calendar are those pertaining to the Regular Establishment and to all wars other than the Civil War. They are the accumulations of about a year. I have not pressed them because the Sells bill, if it became a law, would take care of a large number of these several items on the calendar; and it takes care of about one-half of all of the cases, possibly a little over one-half. The entire amount involved in all five bills is less than \$60,000, I think about \$57,000, provided all of the parties mentioned in the bills live one year.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I am not sure that I understood the Senator; but does not the Sells bill take care of a portion of those embraced in this bill?

Mr. McCUMBER. It does; and therefore, by the amendments which I am offering to each bill, and which in the case of this bill has just been read, I have stricken out all of those covered by the Sells bill, which takes nearly two-thirds out of the bill which has just been read.

Mr. KING. I think the bill which was passed the other day, if the Senator will examine it carefully, will be found to have included within it more than 150 in one particular class that were properly cared for under the Fuller bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. Under the Fuller bill?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; but those were the Civil War veterans. There are no Civil War veterans or widows' cases in this bill at all.

Mr. KING. The Senator does not understand my point. Notwithstanding we passed the Fuller bill to take care of certain classes, we passed a special pension bill, the omnibus bill, the other day, that carried 689 names.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. KING. That provided duplicate lists. It provided for additional pensions to those which were granted by the Fuller bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think they were those that could not receive pensions under the Fuller bill or under any other bill—for instance, where there was less than 90 days' service, and the disability for which the pension was granted was not of service origin. In a case of that kind nothing would be received under the Fuller bill.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator is correct; but I feel confident that a careful examination of the bill which was passed, and a careful examination of the Fuller bill and the interpretation placed upon it, will reveal the fact that there are more than 170, not of the character just mentioned by the Senator, either—that is, those that served less than 90 days—who will get duplicate pensions.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President.

Mr. KING. And what I was apprehensive of was that this bill was a reduplication; that in this bill we were pensioning cases that had been provided for either in the Sells bill or in the Fuller bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is mistaken. I went over those other bills very carefully, and the expert that is furnished us by the Pension Bureau went over it very carefully, and we eliminated from it every one who would receive equal relief under the Fuller bill. Of course, there were those who would receive a less amount than was granted under the Fuller bill, but none who would receive the relief that was granted in that bill.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me to submit a conference report?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WARREN submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14335) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 8, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 26, 37, 39, 50, and 60.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, and 58, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

**"ANTHRACITE COAL COMMISSION.**

"The unexpended balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1920 for the Bituminous Coal Commission is made available during the fiscal years 1920 and 1921 for expenses of the Anthracite Coal Commission, including salaries and expenses of officers, employees and witnesses, personal services in the District of Columbia, purchase of supplies, printing and binding, reporting proceedings, per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4, and all other necessary expenses in connection therewith."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "the passage of this act" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1920"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and roadway thereto, \$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

**"SHIPPING BULLETIN.**

"The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to cause to be prepared in the Office of Communications, Navy Department, a publication known as the Shipping Bulletin, and to publish and furnish the same to the maritime interests of the United States and other interested parties, at the cost of collecting and publishing the information, including the cost of printing and paper and other necessary expenses. The expenses of such bulletin shall be paid from the appropriation 'Engineering,' Bureau of Steam Engineering, fiscal year 1921. The money received from the sale of such publication shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

**"PENSION OFFICE.**

"To provide additional compensation for employees of the Bureau of Pensions designated to carry out the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, \$2,000, to continue available until June 30, 1921: *Provided*, That no person so employed shall receive compensation at a rate exceeding \$1,740 per annum except 1 at \$3,000, 1 at \$2,400, 1 at \$2,000, and 2 at \$1,800 each."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$20" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: " : *Provided*, That paper, envelopes, and blank books required by the stationery rooms of the Senate and House of Representatives for sale to Senators and Members for official use may be purchased from the Public Printer at actual cost thereof and payment therefor shall be made before delivery"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out in lines 2 and 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment the words "or before October 1 of each year" and insert in lieu thereof "the first day of each regular session"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an

amendment as follows: Strike out of the matter inserted by said amendment lines 69, 70, 71, 72, 76, 77, 78, and 79, and in line 103 strike out "\$863,568.91" and insert in lieu thereof "\$854,735.49"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "5"; and the Senate agree to the same.

F. E. WARREN,  
CHAS. CURTIS,  
O. W. UNDERWOOD,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

JAMES W. GOOD,  
J. G. CANNON,  
JAMES F. BYRNES,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. HARRISON. As the Senate will recall, Mr. President, there was adopted on this bill last evening an amendment providing for a change in the assignment of the school board in the District of Columbia, a matter which had been very thoroughly investigated and considered, and on which the committee had made a unanimous report. After the adoption of the amendment the bill went to conference, and the Senate conferees have receded on it, and it is eliminated by virtue of this report. I understand that in conference, out of six conferees, there was only one conferee who objected to it. If the report should be adopted without Congress taking some action touching the school situation here, we will leave the people of the District of Columbia in a very bad situation touching the schools from now until December.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. It would be hardly fair to say that there was but one opposed. There was one of the three House conferees, I might say, diligently opposed, and the other two gave no expression, as I remember it, in the conference either for or against.

Mr. HARRISON. I will say to the Senator that I have talked to at least one of the House conferees, and my information came from that House conferee touching the matter to the effect that there were two House conferees who were willing to accept it, but one House conferee was not willing to accept it and was unwilling to sign the report in the event it should be agreed to by the other conferees.

This is a matter of such great importance to the people of the District that it does seem to me Congress should not adjourn without some definite action taken touching this situation. The House has never voted upon the proposition, and it was eliminated by the wish of one conferee. So I am hoping that the chairman of the committee will allow the report to be rejected, so that it can go back to conference and go to the House, that there may be a vote taken upon that amendment, and the will of the House expressed. I am wondering if the Senator from Wyoming will not accept that and let us vote down the report, and let the House vote, at least, on this amendment.

There is another amendment on which the Senate conferees receded, in which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] is very much interested as well as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Chamberlain] and some other Senators, and I am interested in it, too. I was hopeful that the report could go back to conference, so that the House could take a vote on at least those two propositions.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, of course it is not in the hands of the conferees to take it back to conference, and it will not go back, unless it is sent by the Senate. I regret that any report which we make at this late hour upon an appropriation bill can not be accepted offhand; but the next best thing, of course, is to settle whether the report shall be sent back, and if it is to go back, to send it back without delay, because long debate here and delay means that the bill will fail this year, and the failure to pass supply bills means that we shall have to be assembled again to enact legislation to cover the wants for which the bill provides.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. McKellar. Will the Senator oppose its being sent back to conference? The proposition in which the Senator from Mississippi is interested, and those in which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Chamberlain] and I are interested, are just as proper as any claims in this deficiency appropriation bill. They are provided for by law. There is no question about it. There can not be any question about it. It is a plain case of the Gov-



ernment owing the money, and the amount has been found in a legal way. I do not think that the conferees on the part of the Senate should have agreed to let these matters go out, and I am not willing to agree that they shall be left out if I can prevent it. I do not know whether we can prevent it or not, but I do not want to have it done; it ought not to be done.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, as to the two angles of the remarks of the Senator, in the first instance, there is but one way, of course, to handle the matter. The conferees made their report and moved its adoption. They have done the best they can. If the Senate thinks that to send it back may be to obtain better results, the conferees will certainly do the best they can to get better results.

The second angle of the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee that the claim in which he is interested is provided for by law, and so on, leads me to say that we have provided directly by law that certain losses in public buildings sustained by contractors, who made their bids before the 6th of April, the day war was declared, and who entered into the contracts later, should be recouped for the money actually lost, after submitting the contracts to the Secretary of the Treasury, and he having them examined by proper experts; and the law states that they shall be paid upon that finding.

There is a difference in the two laws. The claim made by the conferees, whom we met, is that as to these particular claims, one of the river and harbor appropriation bills contains a clause analogous, of course, as to what I have said as to the law in respect to public buildings, except that it says that they shall be examined and a report regarding them shall be made to Congress. The conferees we met take the ground that in that way we are not authorized, except by legislation, first, to bring them under the law, which requires an appropriation. I am simply giving the Senate its ground as to that, and telling the Senate the difference which exists between the two classes of cases.

I think the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Mississippi will also remember that, as to the particular claim in controversy, I have been compelled to deny its admission to earlier appropriation bills because it had not then been so certified; that is, it had not been amended. But I may say to the Senators that it gave me great pleasure to think that we had arrived at a point where we could honor it and place it in this bill; and my fellow conferees, I am sure, will say that we did the best we could.

Mr. HARRISON. We are sure of that and we appreciate it very much. But I ask the Senator if he has any objection, in view of these circumstances, to the report being rejected, so that we can send it back?

Mr. WARREN. I can not come in with a conference report and say that I agree to send it back; but I do say that it is here for the Senate to act upon; and if the Senate wishes to send it back I shall very gracefully accept that command. I hope Senators will take into consideration the one fact that we are skating on very thin ice now to get through and go home to-morrow and not be called back to take care of some of these matters.

Mr. HARRISON. I will say to the Senator that is the reason why I am very glad he called it up this early, so that if we reject the report it can go immediately to conference and then to the House and they can vote on the proposition. In view of the importance of the proposition, I hope that the Senate will reject the conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the report be rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. May I ask the Senator from Mississippi if it is not true that the amendment is essential to the conduct of the schools of the District during the coming year?

Mr. HARRISON. It is absolutely essential because of the present conditions. The president of the board of education has refused to call a meeting of the board, and everything is up in the air. I read the other day that at least four or five members of the board of education have gone out of the city. The whole thing is up in the air and will be until Congress takes some action. It will be an outrage if Congress refuses to take some action touching the public-school system of the District at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

A division was called for and taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMOOT. It is too late to ask for the yeas and nays after the result has been announced by the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no reason why we can not ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMOOT. I will leave it to the Chair to decide as to whether under the rules, after the decision is announced by the Chair, the yeas and nays can be ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no rule. The Constitution provides that on any question the yeas and nays shall be taken at the desire of one-fifth of the Senators present.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should like to ask a question with reference to moving that the conference report be agreed to. I understood the motion to be that it be recommitted. I may be mistaken.

Mr. McKELLAR. I moved to reject it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The very constitution of the Senate makes the motion itself. It is, Shall the conference report be agreed to?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, what was done with the request for the yeas and nays?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There has not been anything done yet.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] which I transfer to the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. COMER] and vote "yea."

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick]. I understand if he were here he would vote as I am about to vote. I therefore feel at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent. In his absence I have agreed to take care of him with a pair. However, I find that I can transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER], which I do and vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GAY. I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and vote "yea."

Mr. BECKHAM. I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I notice that he has not voted. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and let my vote stand.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. In his absence, I transfer my pair to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and let my vote stand.

Mr. CALDER (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS]. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. WADSWORTH] and let my vote stand.

Mr. SPENCER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], but under the arrangement I have with him I feel free to vote on this question. I vote "yea."

May I announce that the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] are engaged on official business in a hearing before the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. FERNALD. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE], and vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to announce that I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I feel at liberty to vote on this question, and therefore will let my vote stand.

Mr. HARRISON (after having voted in the negative). I change my vote from "nay" to "yea." I desire to submit a

parliamentary inquiry. Is a motion to reconsider in order before the presence or absence of a quorum is developed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 14, as follows:

## YEAS—28.

Beckham	Hale	McNary	Smoot
Brandegge	Harding	New	Spencer
Calder	Harrison	Page	Sterling
Curtis	Henderson	Phipps	Thomas
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Sheppard	Trammell
Gay	Keyes	Simmons	Underwood
Glass	McCumber	Smith, Md.	Warren

## NAYS—14.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Phelan	Smith, Ga.
Capper	King	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Chamberlain	McKellar	Ransdell	
Dillingham	Nugent	Robinson	

## NOT VOTING—54.

Ball	Gore	McCormick	Shields
Borah	Gronna	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Harris	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Comer	Johnson, Calif.	Myers	Stanley
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Swanson
Edge	Kellogg	Norris	Townsend
Elkins	Kendrick	Overman	Wadsworth
Fall	Kenyon	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Kirby	Penrose	Watson
Fletcher	Knox	Polindexter	Williams
France	La Follette	Pomerene	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Reed	
Gerry	Lodge	Sherman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. No quorum is present. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hale	New	Smoot
Beckham	Harding	Page	Spencer
Calder	Harris	Phelan	Sterling
Capper	Harrison	Phipps	Thomas
Chamberlain	Henderson	Pittman	Trammell
Curtis	Hitchcock	Ransdell	Underwood
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Keyes	Sheppard	Warren
Fernald	King	Simmons	
Gay	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	
Glass	McKellar	Smith, Md.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BRANDEGEE and Mr. NUGENT answered to their names when called.

Mr. SUTHERLAND and Mr. McNARY entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators. The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the instructions of the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE, Mr. KENYON, Mr. REED, Mr. GERRY, and Mr. KENDRICK entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee of conference on what is known as the general deficiency appropriation bill. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. GAY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair and its transfer to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], I vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair and its transfer as on previous roll calls I vote "yea."

Mr. SPENCER (when his name was called). Making the same announcement with regard to my pair, I vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WARSON]. I am unable to obtain a transfer of that pair, and therefore am unable to vote on this question.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRISON (after having voted in the negative). I desire to change my vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. STERLING. Making the same announcement as on the previous roll call as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (after having voted in the negative). Announcing the same transfer as heretofore, I will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]; and

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The roll call resulted—yeas 33, nays 16, as follows:

## YEAS—33.

Beckham	Harding	McNary	Sterling
Brandegge	Harris	Page	Sutherland
Calder	Harrison	Phelan	Thomas
Curtis	Henderson	Phipps	Trammell
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Sheppard	Underwood
Fernald	Kenyon	Simmons	Warren
Gay	Keyes	Smith, Md.	
Glass	Lodge	Smoot	
Hale	McCumber	Spencer	

## NAYS—16.

Ashurst	Gerry	Nugent	Reed
Capper	Hitchcock	Pittman	Robinson
Chamberlain	King	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.
Dillingham	McKellar	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.

## NOT VOTING—47.

Ball	Gore	McLean	Shields
Borah	Gronna	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Comer	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Stanley
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Swanson
Cummins	Kellogg	Newberry	Townsend
Edge	Kendrick	Norris	Wadsworth
Elkins	Kirby	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	Knox	Owen	Watson
Fletcher	La Follette	Penrose	Williams
France	Lenroot	Polindexter	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Sherman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the question of agreeing to the conference report the yeas are 33, the nays are 16, Senator WOLCOTT being present in the Chamber and not voting, making a quorum. The conference report is agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. No; I want to occupy the floor for a while.

Mr. President, I was very sorry that the chairman of the committee did not agree to this motion, so that the conference report, with the school provision eliminated, might go back to conference and the House could vote upon that proposition; and I feel that the question is of so much importance that I should occupy the time of the Senate for as long as I may hold out in opposition to this conference report.

In addressing the Senate touching this conference report I shall confine my remarks to the school question in the District; and so I can say to the Senators here present that if they do not desire to hear this school question discussed and want to smoke a little bit or promenade for a long while or do anything else that they desire, they shall have plenty of time in which to do it.

It seems that it is a pity that the American Congress does not feel that the District affairs should receive sufficient consideration at its hands to allow at least such an important question as this to be considered by the other House. The amendment in question is carrying out the views of the select committee investigating the school conditions. It was a unanimous report.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield for a question.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator should succeed in defeating the conference report, would he thereby assist the schools? Would he achieve his point by the defeat of this bill?

I ask the question because I sympathize with the Senator's view and have uniformly voted with him; but I do not perceive how, by defeating the conference report, he will assist the schools that he is so ably trying to assist.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, the Senator has the same viewpoint about this matter that I have. He is a very practical man and one of the best Senators I have ever met in my life.



I always like to hear him, because I think he is about the most eloquent Senator in the United States.

Mr. ASHURST. I admit it. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The occupants of the galleries are not here to furnish applause. They must keep still.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, if this conference report is defeated, the amendment of the Senate, attached to it by practically a unanimous vote, goes with it to the scrap heap, and unfortunately no legislation will pass; but I hope that the very distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], who not only has the schools of the District at heart, but has the interests of the people at heart, who has a big heart himself, will reconsider and allow this conference report to go back to conference, and then let it go before the House to be voted on upon this proposition. Then we can go along smoothly for the balance of the night, and take up some of these other questions that may be pending, and we might then take up the bill that was referred to by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] this morning.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator will pardon me, I hope he will forgive my facetiousness of a moment ago. I really want to be practical on the question. The Senator will perceive that on two roll calls I voted with him.

Mr. HARRISON. I know the Senator did.

Mr. ASHURST. And the Senator's powerful argument the other night on the situation in regard to the schools of this District had very much to do with influencing my vote.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator always votes right.

Mr. ASHURST. But on the last roll call there were 33 votes for the adoption of this conference report and 12 votes against it.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. ASHURST. And I voted with the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. That is right. The Senator voted right.

Mr. ASHURST. But I do not perceive how there is any reasonable probability that that large majority, over two to one, will change its view and adopt the view of the 16, which is only half. If it would do so, I should be very happy.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has perceived, as I have perceived in this body, that very often some of the Senators change their minds and vote one way and then vote another way; but I think—and the Senator will agree with me, I am quite sure—that the reason why the Senators voted "aye" there was because the chairman having the matter in charge was voting that way. Of course if the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Wyoming, whom I love, would just say the word and let this report go back to conference and over to the House and have a vote on it, as I was going to say when the Senator from Arizona interrupted me, we could perhaps in the course of the evening get up the bill that was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] touching the sugar question; we could take up other bills that other Senators have been desirous of getting up, and pass them; we could pass this very important bill increasing the pay of the postal employees; we could take up the conference report on the shipping bill; we could take up the District of Columbia appropriation bill; and there are many bills that we could take up and consider if I could persuade the Senator from Wyoming to allow this conference report to go back to conference and let the House pass upon it.

It seems to me that that would be the very proper thing to do in view of the circumstances. I do not like to work any more than any other Senator desires to work, but there were five of us who gave from two to five hours a day for two months working upon a matter which, of course, our immediate constituencies were not interested in, except indirectly, as they are interested in civilization generally; but we were working in order to study the school situation here; we were working at the instance and at the direction of the United States Senate, trying to find out what was the matter with the school situation in the District of Columbia. We gave our time unstintedly, tried to be impartial in the consideration of that question; we tried to deal with it in a fair and in a just way, and, as I said, we left our offices from two to five hours a day for two months, and gave our time to consider that question, and after considering it that long we unanimously agreed upon a report as to what ought to be done.

With the exception of myself, the members of that committee were men of high intelligence, superb ability, thoroughly patriotic, and wanted to do the right thing for the schools. If that committee is to be repudiated by the Senate and by the House of Representatives, and all of its work held for naught, all of its suggestions thrown to the winds, all of the policies which were advocated in its report repudiated, then well and good; but I feel that the matter is of such importance that it at least should be discussed, and discussed at length.

I hope the Senator from Wyoming was listening to me when I made that suggestion. I will make it again. I will make it to the leader of the majority, too. I was in hopes that the big-hearted Senator from Wyoming, who I am sure is in sympathy with what the committee on the school investigation reported and is in sympathy with this amendment, because he voted for it, and advocated it not only here in the Senate but in the conference, would allow this to go back to conference, and let the House pass upon the proposition.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask a question?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield for a question.

Mr. LODGE. What assurance has the Senator that the conferees on the part of the House will allow it to go back to the House?

Mr. HARRISON. I have the assurance from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House that if the Senate votes down the report and it goes back into conference, he will present it to the House, and that he will do his best to get a separate vote upon the proposition. I could not have any better assurance than that, and certainly we would do a great deal of good for the schools of the District if they would agree with the Senate's action on it, and it is due to the House not to let one man thwart the will of the House, and they should be given the privilege of voting upon this very important question. It seems to me that it is almost a travesty for the Congress to adjourn to-morrow and leave the situation as it will affect the schools in the condition in which we will leave it if this conference report is adopted as it now stands.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator another question? Suppose the House declined to yield; then we would be simply where we are now, and to send the report back would hardly be worth while?

Mr. HARRISON. If the House, on a separate vote upon this proposition, should not agree with the action of the Senate and should vote down that amendment, I am through. I will have done everything I could do; I will have performed my duty. The other members of the select committee, I think, feel as I do—that they have done their duty.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think the Senator knows that I have been in sympathy with him—

Mr. HARRISON. Absolutely; and I appreciate it.

Mr. LODGE. And in sympathy with what he is doing, in sympathy with him about Van Schaick and about all the Senator has been trying to do for the schools; but I should like to get the deficiency appropriation bill through if possible so that we may adjourn to-morrow.

Mr. HARRISON. I am in sympathy with the Senator, too.

Mr. LODGE. If the House conferees refuse to take it back, we have no means of forcing them.

Mr. HARRISON. I am quite sure the House conferees will not refuse to take it back. I have told the Senator the conversation I had with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House. I think he is in entire sympathy with this amendment, and I think he would like to have the House vote on it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield for a question.

Mr. CURTIS. What if the House conferees fail to get a separate vote in the House? Then would the Senator be satisfied?

Mr. HARRISON. I think we ought to have a separate vote in the House.

Mr. CURTIS. I say, what would happen if the House conferees do not get a separate vote in the House?

Mr. HARRISON. I can not understand the theory of government under which one man can thwart the will of the American Congress.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am very much interested in the repetition of that statement by the Senator about one man thwarting the will of Congress. Would the Senator object to enlightening me by telling me who that one man is who is so potent?

Mr. HARRISON. He is one of the House conferees, who objected to this proposition, and stated that he would not sign the report with this amendment in it; and so the other House Members, in order to be congenial, said that they would stand by him.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is a combination, then, that is thwarting the will of Congress. The Senator made an appeal a while ago to the Senator from Wyoming to let this report go back. May I ask the Senator if it would not be more appropriate to address that request to the Senate?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If so, why not let us vote on the motion to reconsider, and see what the Senate has to say about it?

Mr. HARRISON. I was in hopes that the Senate would agree to let it go back to conference. I wanted to discuss the proposition for a while before we voted on the motion to reconsider. Did the Senator from Wyoming desire to ask me a question?

Mr. WARREN. I want to make a few remarks, if the Senator will permit.

Mr. HARRISON. I yield for a question.

Mr. WARREN. What I say I will say in all kindness, of course. I have been somewhat interested in the Senator's remark about one man holding up the Congress. I am satisfied, if I can take the word of the Senator from Mississippi, that that is exactly what he intends to do to-night—to hold up the Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir; I intend to hold it up. I am perfectly candid with the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. In other words, the Senator is intending to do what he condemns in somebody else?

Mr. HARRISON. No. One gentleman is holding it up because we are trying to help the schools in the District, and I am holding it up because the American Congress refuses to do anything for the schools of this District, and is going to adjourn leaving the schools in their present condition.

Mr. WARREN. I want to go along bit by bit, so I may know just where we are moving. I take the Senator at his word. He has the power, under the rules of the Senate, without question, and if he is a good, industrious talker, of course, he can talk until daylight, and stay here, and we lose the bill. I have no objection whatever to the Senate sending the report back to the conferees, and we shall do the very best we can, as we did before. But, of course, the Senator must remember that, first, we have to secure at least two of the three House conferees to agree with us; and, second, if they refuse to take the matter back to the House, we can not compel them to do so. If they go back to the House, and the House does not sustain the proposition the Senator from Mississippi makes, of course, we can not help that. Since the Senator has been so frank, I would like to know just how far we must go; just where our boundaries may be if we shall send it back.

Mr. HARRISON. If we send it back, we will have taken a very good step. I think that the House ought to vote on the proposition, unless the House conferees would agree to the proposition.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have been in a good many pretty close quarters in conferences, and I recall times when we have been sent back where we have met a great deal of sturdy opposition on the ground that we did not make any effort to have our report sustained, and so forth.

Mr. HARRISON. They can not make that charge to-night.

Mr. WARREN. It is now in the hands of the Senate. They are to pass upon it. Besides the item to which the Senator is objecting, there are two or three others which undoubtedly will be objected to, even if we can settle this one. I should like to know something about those to see whether we are going to get this matter finally settled if we go back and struggle with the conferees.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want a separate vote on the item in which the Senator knows I am interested. It is a claim of constituents of mine provided for by law, and I think they are entitled to have what the law gives them. If the House votes it down on a separate vote, then I shall be willing to let it go.

Mr. HARRISON. Did the Senator from Wyoming have some suggestion?

Mr. WARREN. I was going to say further that of course it would be useless for the Senate to send the report back unless the Senator himself and those with him have confidence that the conferees will do the best they can. Having done the best they can, I want to know what we are going to do if it should happen that we should be unsuccessful on any one of these matters, and I do not mean by that that we should go back intending to be unsuccessful.

Mr. HARRISON. I think the Senator has done admirably. I know the Senator has tried to take care of the amendment in which I am interested and of those in which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] are interested, but I think the House ought to pass on such important propositions as have been eliminated.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator seems to be in close connection with the Senator from Tennessee. Is the matter in which the Senator from Tennessee is interested a part of this? How is that to be settled?

Mr. HARRISON. I understood the Senator from Tennessee to state that he desires a separate vote in the House on his proposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let it take exactly the same course the others do.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator says the same course. I do not know that we can get the same course taken, but if I may, I want to go a little further and ask the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] in regard to a proposition in which he is interested. I want to inform the Senator, because we may as well understand this whole situation, that we were compelled to recede upon an amendment of \$4,100 for park policemen, which the Senator has advocated very sincerely and enthusiastically. Is the Senator going to interpose any conditions in regard to that item?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I desire to be perfectly frank about the matter.

Mr. WARREN. I am trying to get the matter settled, and to get the conference report agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. I realize it very fully. The Senator has properly described my attitude when he says I have been enthusiastic about this matter, and I have been enthusiastic about it because the Congress has been guilty of the grossest kind of an injustice against 10 policemen in the Zoological Park. Increases in salary have been given to every other class of policemen in the District, but because of the fact that 10 policemen who are immediately under the control of the Smithsonian Institution, and have heretofore been paid out of a lump sum, have been overlooked by the Appropriations Committees both of the Senate and of the House, they are to be deprived of a similar increase. I realize that it is hardly the fair thing to hold up an entire appropriation bill for the benefit of 10 policemen, but those 10 policemen have to be clothed and fed, and some of them at least have families.

I am not going to concede at this moment that when these facts are fully known to the conferees of the House they are going to deny simple and exact justice to these 10 men. If the conference report comes back, I shall determine my course by the position which we may then be in. I shall have done all that I think I can do, but I want to appeal to the sense of justice on the part of the conferees of the Senate as well as of the House. I believe the Senate conferees have done all that they can in that behalf. I am amazed that an item of this kind should have been stricken out of the bill in conference. There is no defense that can be made of it.

Mr. WARREN. I have not yet received any assurance about the matter of the river and harbor claim. In other words, I want to know "where we are at."

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought I had stated my position. If it comes back I will use my own judgment as to what is necessary to be done at that time.

Mr. WARREN. Then we might as well talk about it for a few days, because to come back half-handed in that way accomplishes no object whatever. I am anxious to get upon a ground where we could take the conference report back, but not with one subject at a time and with no assurance as to the others.

Mr. HARRISON. May I say to the Senator that I am interested in this claim matter the same as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]? There are about 12 of those, but this is all in one amendment. They could take a separate vote in the House on that proposition. I can not see how they could do otherwise. Is that not agreeable?

Mr. WARREN. The Senator says they are all in one amendment. They are not connected in any way whatever.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand it was all in one estimate of three hundred and some odd thousand dollars from the Treasury Department.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, yes.

Mr. HARRISON. It is not one item still, in the bill?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; just one item.

Mr. HARRISON. It would take just one vote on that proposition. I understood the Senator from Tennessee to state that it would be satisfactory to go back to conference, to go into the House, and if they should vote him down—

Mr. WARREN. If I am going to help get this back, I shall have to have some assurance from Senators, when we have fought for them the best we can to the end of the line, whether we are coming back and are then to be held up, if I may use that expression.

Mr. HARRISON. I say to the Senator that I shall not attempt to hold it up, but will try to help the Senator expedite it, if the matter goes back to conference and the House votes upon the proposition, or it need not go back to a vote if the House conferees will agree to it.

Mr. WARREN. Of course, the Senator knows that I can offer no assurance that the House will vote on it.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that perfectly.



Mr. WARREN. I will give him every assurance that I will do my best.

Mr. HARRISON. If it should go to conference, then, of course, the House conferees could refuse to take it back; but I sincerely believe they would take it back and try to agree on the proposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. There will be two separate votes—one on the river and harbor claims and the other on the school question—

Mr. WARREN. When does the Senator mean?

Mr. McKELLAR. Unless the conferees agree to accept them. In that case, of course, there would be no trouble about it.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator mean if we get into trouble with this matter and bring it back, they still will try to have votes on these two matters?

Mr. McKELLAR. All that I ask is that these two matters go to the House and let the House vote on them.

Mr. WARREN. But suppose they do not go to the House? Suppose we are not able to get them there?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, they will go to the House.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Wyoming knows if we commit ourselves on the floor of the Senate that we would be satisfied if we go to conference and the conferees on the part of the House refuse to take it back there that that would satisfy us.

Mr. WARREN. But the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has not given that assurance.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; and I do not understand the Senator from Mississippi has done so. We both ask that these two matters be taken back to conference and the House conferees submit the two questions to the House. If they vote us down in the House, then that is a matter that we have nothing further to say about, but if they do not vote us down, our items would be in the bill.

Mr. WARREN. The conference report is the property of the Senate. We have made that report and placed it on the table. I should be very glad to assist Senators to send it back by the vote of the Senate if the Senate thinks that with the present condition of things it should go back. I should like to cooperate, of course. There is the situation. The Senate has heard the Senator from Mississippi state his intentions about it, and other Senators as well, but we had better dispose of it one way or the other.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the request of the Senator from Mississippi does not seem to me to be an unreasonable one. The Senator has made a most diligent fight for the provision with reference to the schools here. He won out in the Senate. The chairman of the committee knows what the vote was on that. The Senate also voted in by unanimous vote the river and harbor items in the bill. Now, all that the Senator asks is that the conferees take the bill back and have the question voted on by the House. It is not an unreasonable request. The chairman insists that he is willing to do that if the Senate will send the conference report back, but the Senate has shown an indisposition to do that.

Mr. WARREN. It is not in my possession. I have said to the Senator and to the Senate that if the Senate will vote to send this back now after hearing these statements I shall be very glad to take it back.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator once more?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Will the Senator ask the Senate to do that?

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the report be sent back to conference with instructions that the conferees be asked to request a separate vote in the House upon these two items.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to it in the world, but what is the next step? Suppose we lose? We can not make the House conferees take it back. We can not make the House vote on it. If the House refuses for any reason, we are just where we are now. What is gained?

Mr. McKELLAR. On the other hand, if we agree beforehand as to the matter, if we let it go that way, we would feel like the celebrated—

Mr. LODGE. If Senators would agree that it should be taken back and an effort made to get it submitted to the House, and if that failed, then we should have a vote and pass the bill, that would be one thing.

Mr. HARRISON. Why can we not, as the Senator from Massachusetts has suggested, let the conference report go back to conference and have the conferees upon the part of the Senate urge in every possible way that the House conferees take it to the House for a separate vote and stop there?

Mr. LODGE. We would be no better off then than we are now.

Mr. McKELLAR. We could not be any worse off than we are now. We might be entirely well off, we might get the mat-

ter settled, but as it is now I do not see how we could be worse off than we are.

Mr. HARRISON. I am trying to help the Senator to get straight on this proposition.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me we could get together if Senators would give the assurance that if we made every effort to get it back to the House and failed, the prevention of the vote would be withdrawn, and that would get us somewhere.

If we are simply to go to the House and if we fail to get a vote on it and come back here and begin the filibuster over again we might as well make up our minds to it and reconsider the adjournment resolution and take our time on the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from Wyoming make the suggestion that the conference report go back to conference?

Mr. WARREN. It is before us on the motion which the Senator made. The Senator moved to reconsider. Let us take a vote on that question.

Mr. HARRISON. The trouble now is that when that vote is taken, if I am voted down on the question of a reconsideration, I have lost the floor, and I expect to hold the floor until some agreement is made.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator undertakes to hold the floor until these conferees can guarantee him exactly what they can come back with, the Senator from Mississippi would hold it until next January.

Mr. HARRISON. I made no suggestion as to that. I do not think the Senator from Wyoming understood me. I said that if I give up the floor on a motion to reconsider, then I would be down and out. I propose this: I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be rejected by the Senate and be sent back to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 13962. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, at or near the borough of Wilson, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

H. R. 14368. An act to provide revenue, encourage domestic industries, and make provision for the national defense by the elimination, through the assessment of special duties, of unfair foreign competition in the sale of aeroplanes imported into the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 13266. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 14208. An act to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended.

#### MONONGAHELA RIVER BRIDGE.

H. R. 13962. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, at or near the borough of Wilson, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report from the Committee on Commerce. I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 13962) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, and so forth, and I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am going to object to the consideration of other bills than appropriation bills until we get through with the pension bill that was before the Senate some time ago.

Mr. CALDER. Will not the Senator permit this bill to be considered? It is merely a bridge bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. There are 40 others, and I have been waiting six months to get these pension bills through. I think it is about time that we should reach a vote on them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made. The bill will go to the calendar, and the consideration of the pension bill will be resumed.

#### PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (S. 3747) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and

Navy, and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. Insert at the proper place in the bill the following:

The name of Margaret Howell Butler, widow of Matthew C. Butler, jr., late lieutenant colonel of Cavalry, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask for the present disposition of House bill 14368, which is on the Secretary's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator wishes to have it handed down?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

H. R. 14368. An act to provide revenue, encourage domestic industries, and make provision for the national defense by the elimination, through the assessment of special duties, of unfair foreign competition in the sale of aeroplanes imported into the United States, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I desire to object to the second reading of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

#### PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7775) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. KING. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee why this bill was not included in the measure just considered?

Mr. McCUMBER. Simply because the House reported it as a separate bill and it was taken up at a separate time and disposed of at a separate time and reported out from the committee several weeks after the other bill.

Mr. KING. Is it of the same character as the one we just considered?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is of the same character. All of them refer to the general establishment or wars other than the Civil War.

Mr. KING. I have opposed some pension bills, and I do not regard this as having a greater merit than some of those recently passed, but no opposition upon the part of Senators will prevent affirmative action, so I shall not object to its consideration.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the formal reading of the bill will be dispensed with, and the bill will be read for amendment, committee amendments to be first considered.

Mr. McCUMBER. On behalf of the committee I offer the amendments, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 1, after line 5, it is proposed to strike out:

The name of Hannah J. Clark, widow of William H. Clark, late of Troop E, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 2, to strike out:

The name of James L. Buckler, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Charles W. Van Scoyk, late of Company G, Third Regiment Ohio Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 13, to strike out:

The name of Sophie Reimuller, widow of George Reimuller, late of Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional for minor child until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Carson Rummel, late of Company I, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Bohntinsky, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Rebecca Strouther, mother of Charles Strouther, late of Company G, Forty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 1, after the word "Strain" to insert "alias Lewis Monroe," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Lewis M. Strain, alias Lewis Monroe, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of Charles Voos, late of Company D, Third Regiment Connecticut Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ernest Meyer, late of Company M, Second Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of James O. Carroll, late of Company K, Second Regiment Arkansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to strike out:

The name of Maria Kuehn, widow of Charles Kuehn, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Marion P. Barnett, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Missouri Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Joseph Roddy, late of Company I, First Regiment Missouri Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John C. Graves, late of Company L, Thirty-third Regiment Michigan Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William E. Sloane, dependent father of Alexander G. B. Sloane, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Schuyler van Tassel, late of Company M, Thirty-fifth Regiment Michigan Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Samuel W. Van Riper, late of Company E, Thirty-second Regiment, and Company E, Twenty-first Regiment, United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Reinhard Anschutz, alias Charles Reinhard, late of Troop L, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of John J. Burke, late of Troop D, First Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John C. Koeplinger, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Ohio Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Beehler, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Ohio Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of William McBride, late of Company A, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, beginning in line 1, to strike out:

The name of Wynn M. Mays, late of Company K, Second Mississippi Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George W. Chandler, late of Troop F, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Martha Tyler, widow of William Tyler, late of Capt. Jernigan's Company of Mounted Volunteers, Seminole Indian Wars of Florida in 1856 and 1857, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.



The name of Walter S. McQuaide, late of Company A, First Regiment United States Volunteer Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Narcissa A. Grant, formerly widow of Sylvain Trichill, late of Company I, Fifth (Peyton's) Regiment Louisiana Militia Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Lizzie Eaton Webster, widow of Leicester Webster, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas S. Garen, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Barton E. Connor, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Illinois Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 8, to strike out:

The name of Peter Beebe, late of Company F, Forty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Martha Tyler, widow of William Tyler, late of Capt. Jernigan's Company of Mounted Volunteers, Seminole Indian Wars of Florida in 1856 and 1857, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Walter S. McQuaide, late of Company A, First Regiment United States Volunteer Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Narcissa A. Grant, formerly widow of Sylvain Trichill, late of Company I, Fifth (Peyton's) Regiment Louisiana Militia Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Lizzie Eaton Webster, widow of Leicester Webster, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas S. Garen, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 23, before the word "mother," insert "dependent," and in line 24, before the word "late," to strike out "deceased," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Emma Golden, dependent mother of John Byron Golden, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, beginning in line 1, to strike out:

The name of Ulysses G. Hunt, late of Company I, Third Regiment Kentucky Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Flen Whalin, late of Company B, Third Regiment Kentucky Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Caroline M. Anthony, late contract nurse, Medical Department, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William H. Branc, late of Battery F, Third Regiment United States Field Artillery, New York National Guard, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Baxter Hogan, late of Company F, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, from this amendment, which the Committee on Pensions has reported to the pending bill, the chairman is willing the Senate shall recede. This provides for a small pension of \$12 a month, which was allowed by the other House, to Baxter Hogan, but I have submitted to the chairman of the committee affidavits from six reputable men covering the point in doubt in the case, and he has agreed that the amendment may be rejected. I ask that the committee amendment rejecting the pension to Baxter Hogan be disagreed to.

Mr. KING. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Georgia if the ground of striking out the pension by the committee was a bigamous marriage?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; it was a doubt as to whether the injury did not antedate the pensioner's entering the service, and I have produced affidavits from a half dozen reputable men, including one physician, showing that the injuries did antedate the service of the pensioner and did not occur after his service.

Mr. McCUMBER. I desire to say that the additional evidence furnished by the Senator from Georgia since the report was made would have made a difference in the report of the Committee on Pensions relative to this case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 10, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of Clem S. Kirkham, late of Troop L, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Howard M. Blankenship, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of James J. Shortell, late of Company F, Seventy-first Regiment New York Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 22, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$17" and insert "\$24," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Frank M. Cottrell, late of Company F, Forty-ninth Regiment Iowa Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 23, to strike out:

The name of William B. Hendricks, late of Company I, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The next amendment was, on page 11, beginning in line 1, to strike out:

The name of John E. Schilling, late of Company A, Second Regiment West Virginia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Miller Kincaid, late of One hundred and fourteenth Company United States Coast Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 9, to strike out:

The name of Fred. Jahrlies, late of Company L, Thirty-third Regiment, United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of George E. Lovin, late of Company F, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel B. Reddicks, late of Company E, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, beginning in line 1, to strike out:

The name of William Mendenhall, late of Company E, Thirty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Louis N. Hickey, late of Company B, Second Regiment New York Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 7, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Georgeanna C. Pierson, dependent mother of William D. Pierson, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 13, to strike out:

The name of Gilbert E. Donnell, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Illinois Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Willard Kolp, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Ohio Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Nathaniel Singletary, late second lieutenant of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Kansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 25, after the words "Second Regiment," to strike out "(reorganized)," and, in the same line, after the words "Ohio Volunteers," to strike out "(Mexican War)" and insert "War with Mexico," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Daniel Gonder, late of Company B, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of John H. Alford, late of Company B, Second Regiment Tennessee Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 9, to strike out:

The name of Jean N. Roach, widow of Ernest S. Roach, late first lieutenant of Company A, First Regiment Oklahoma Volunteer Infantry, National Guard, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month and \$2 per month for the soldier's minor children until they reach 16 years of age.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of William J. Linn, late of Company M, Third Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain; Company H, Forty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and First and Tenth Batteries, United States Field Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 7, after the words "per month," to strike out "with \$2 per month for each of the minor children of Charles N. Miller" and insert "and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Charles N. Miller until they reach the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mamie K. Miller, widow of Charles N. Miller, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Charles N. Miller until they reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Cosam J. Bartlett, late major, First Louisiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Mary Kirk, formerly widow of James A. Taggart, late of Capt. Hudspeth's Company C, California Battalion, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Clemson Underwood, late of Company K, First Regiment Montana Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James E. Householder, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 2, before the word "child," to strike out "deformed" and insert "helpless and dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Annie Kelly, helpless and dependent child of Thomas Kelly, late of Company F, Second Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of George W. Willets, late of Troop E, First Regiment Ohio Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 10, after the words "Mounted Volunteers," to insert "Indian wars," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Sarah M. Gibbins, widow of William A. Gibbins, late member of Capt. John H. Settle's Company D, First Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 19, to strike out:

The name of George S. Jenkins, late of Company H, Nineteenth Kansas Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, to strike out from line 1 to line 3, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Starling N. Caron, late of Company F, Third Regiment Ohio Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ELLEN M. WILLEY.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the desk. I do not know whether or not a similar House bill has come over.

There being no objection, the Senate as in Committee of the Whole proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2707) for the relief of Ellen M. Willey, widow of Owen S. Willey. It provides:

That in the administration of the pension laws the late Owen S. Willey, who served in the United States Navy from July 11, 1860, to April 16, 1863, as an acting master's mate, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the naval service of the United States as an acting master's mate on April 16, 1863; but no pay, bounty, pension, or other emolument shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9281) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the formal reading of the bill will be dispensed with, and the bill will be considered for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move the amendments which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 1, after line 9, it is proposed to strike out:

The name of David S. Williams, late of Troop M, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 2, to strike out:

The name of Jason Adkins, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Joseph McClure, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of John F. Campbell, late of Battery E, First Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 11, to strike out:

The name of Jesse A. R. Forbes, late of Company L, Second Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Patrick H. Madigan, late of Company K, Two hundred and third Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank Shaw, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 4, after the word "additional," to strike out "for soldier's minor child until he shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "on account of the minor child of said Orval Hunsaker until he reaches the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Pearl A. Hunsaker, widow of the late Orval Hunsaker, Company C, Fourth United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Orval Hunsaker until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of Otto M. Payton, late of Company M, Twenty-first Regiment Kansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 19, after the words "per month," to strike out "each for soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "additional on account of each of the minor children of said James A. Powers until they reach the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary A. Powers, widow of James A. Powers, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said James A. Powers until they reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 23, to strike out:

The name of John McGinley, late of Company M, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 4, to strike out:

The name of Martha E. Waldsmith, widow of William A. Waldsmith, late of Twenty-first Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional for each of soldier's minor children until they reach the age of 16 years.



The name of George W. Turner, late of Company L, First Regiment North Carolina Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George W. Oblisk, late of Company A, Thirty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary J. Pack, widow of Thomas J. Pack, late of Company F, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of David M. Allen, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Chester E. Green, late of Company M, First Regiment Nebraska Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 23, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Chester E. Green, late of Company M, First Regiment Nebraska Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 23, to strike out:

The name of Eddie E. Sterrett, late of Battery H, First Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of Bernard M. Stanton, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of Ethel A. Kane, widow of William M. Kane, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month; also \$2 per month additional for sailor's minor child until she shall have reached the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of Fanny Weill, widow of Julius Weill, late of Battery M, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Orville G. Willett, late of Company G, First United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Horace G. Pope, late of Troop D, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 6, to strike out:

The name of Annie M. Wood, widow of Sampson W. Wood, late of Company C, First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Claude H. Dean, late of Company I, Forty-ninth Regiment Iowa Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Coffey, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward S. Coffin, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Irving Wohl, late of Fifth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Brother Buis, late of Company I, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Sarah E. Kiplinger, widow of John Kiplinger, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Louis B. Smith, late of Company B, Forty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Philip E. Hartman, late of Companies A and K, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Susan J. Purcell, widow of John J. Purcell, late of Company F, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional, on account of each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years.

The name of Charles T. Durand, late of Company H, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Charles P. Michener, late of Battery F, First Regiment United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James W. Duty, late of Company L, First Regiment West Virginia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac N. Troutman, late of Company F, First Regiment Idaho Infantry, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elmer Wagar, late of Troop B, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of George C. Hazeltine, late of Company K, Second Regiment Texas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Pleasant D. Cooper, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 6, after the word "Infantry," to insert "Regular Establishment," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Lloyd Shaver, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and Company B, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Michael Mulvey, late of Company E, Forty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, First Regiment West Virginia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of Charles Brubaker, late of the band, and Company M, Third Regiment Georgia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 11, to strike out:

The name of John A. Kennepohl, late of Company K, First Regiment Missouri Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James F. Mitchell, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Howard H. Long, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John W. Paulus, late of Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Simon P. Kieffer, late of Company B, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 21, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$24" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Simon P. Kieffer, late of Company B, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 12, to strike out:

The name of Charley Douthitt, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-ninth Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Schuyler C. Pool, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Casey A. Cox, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James L. Doris, late of Company F, Forty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Frank A. Morton, late of Company H, Forty-ninth Regiment Iowa Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Anson B. Countryman, late of Company F, First Regiment Idaho Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 25, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$40," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Robert S. Parker, late second lieutenant of Company K, Twentieth Regiment Kansas Infantry, War with Spain, and private, Company H, Forty-fourth Iowa Infantry, Civil War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Eugene E. Clark, late of Company L, First Regiment Montana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harry Noel, late of Troop B, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas H. Ivers, late of Company B, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert A. Carnegie, late of Company F, Third Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 14, to strike out:

The name of Eugene Johnson, late of Company L, Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of James W. Mitchell, late of the United States Volunteer Signal Corps, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of August J. Griesbach, late of Company I, Forty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 11, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary S. Langston, dependent mother of Omar Langston, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Thomas L. Feyen, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment Iowa Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Otto O. Yaap, late of the United States Marine Corps, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 15, to strike out:

The name of Thomas D. O'Shea, late of Company L, Forty-seventh Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Tepper, late of Company L, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Robert Noble, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James Prosek, late of Company C, First Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of George H. Haverkate, late of Company C, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Samuel M. Deets, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Missouri Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George H. Bruckner, late of Troop I, Second United States Cavalry, and Company B, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 16, to strike out:

The name of Michael Long, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Nathaniel J. Stonecipher, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 20, after the words "name of," to strike out "Eugenie" and insert "Eugenia"; and in line 22, after the word "Army," to strike out "Regular Establishment" and insert "War with Spain," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Eugenia Schottmueller, dependent mother of Gilbert L. Schottmueller, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, after line 24, to strike out:

The name of Maria Louise Richardson, widow of Robert Richardson, late of Troop I (Marshall's), First Kentucky Cavalry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 1, after the word "Cavalry," to strike out "Mexican War" and insert "War with Mexico"; and, in line 2, after the words "rate of," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Maria Louise Richardson, widow of Robert Richardson, late of Troop I (Marshall's), First Kentucky Cavalry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of Katherine G. Manning, widow of Michael Manning, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional for each of sailor's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Charles M. Fink, late of Company C, Eighth United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of John T. Tingley, late of Company K, First Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Floyd B. Daugherty, late of the band, First Regiment District of Columbia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of David U. Denind, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, after line 23, to strike out:

The name of Edward Hinman, late of Company A, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of William E. Warren, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of William A. Waggoner, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 10, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," and in line 13, before the words "per month" to strike out "\$12" and insert "\$17," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary R. Adair, dependent mother of Henry H. Adair, late first lieutenant, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of George W. Mallin, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 24, after the word "additional," to strike out "for soldier's minor child until she shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "on account of the minor child of said Edgar J. Simson until she reaches the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Stella A. Simson, widow of Edgar J. Simson, late of Company K, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Edgar J. Simson until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.



The next amendment was, on page 19, line 2, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Phebe Spencer, now Schonhoff, dependent mother of Lawrence L. Spencer, late of Company B, Thirty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 5, to strike out:

The name of John Moloney, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 9, to strike out:

The name of John T. Griggs, father of Jones A. Griggs, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Georgia Infantry, National Guard, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 13, to strike out:

The name of Simeon D. Morrison, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Sarah J. Holley, widow of Charles W. Holley, late of Tenth Company, United States Coast Artillery, and Company M, First Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional for each of soldier's minor children until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of James F. Romines, late of Companies D and M, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 20, to strike out:

The name of Jesse W. Beam, late of Company M, Second Regiment New Jersey Infantry, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harry Patterson, late of Battery H, Third Regiment United States Artillery, and Thirtieth Company, United States Coast Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 12, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$25" and insert "\$20," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Jane C. A. Porter, widow of Hugh Porter, late of Capt. Maddox's company, Fremont's California Volunteers, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of James I. Sloan, late of Troop G, Third United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 16, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of June MacM. Ordway, dependent mother of Eliot W. Ordway, late of Company H, Second Regiment Oregon Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 19, to strike out:

The name of John H. Page, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of Kate B. Horan, widow of Jeremiah J. Horan, late of Troop F, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Leroy F. Moore, late of Company H, First Regiment Arkansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Isaac M. Conley, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James T. Brown, late of Troop K, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of Lillie P. Hinman, late a nurse in the War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 22, to strike out:

The name of Adam E. Haughn, late of Company H, First Battalion Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph W. Nolen, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Daniel J. Bresnahan, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Edward J. Davis, late of Company M, Twenty-sixth United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Alice F. Travis, widow of Charles T. Travis, late of United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 19, to strike out:

The name of Anna O'Brien, widow of Frank A. O'Brien, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of William E. Gault, late unassigned and of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christine E. Geiger, widow of Austin Geiger, late of the Fortieth and Eighty-fifth Companies, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional for the soldier's minor child until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Dalbert Gray, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Annie E. Arnold, mother of Robert Edgar Arnold, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of Edward E. Henton, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment, and Company E, Second Regiment, United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles W. Lanham, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John J. Mitchell, late of Company H, Third Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Carl C. Dunham, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Andrew Kravets, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert H. Roberts, late of Company L, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel B. Yeaple, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Pierre L. Carmouche, late first Lieutenant Company L, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John B. Peters, late of Company K, First Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Emma S. Norton, widow of Lewis A. Norton, late first Lieutenant Company I, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteers, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Tebitha E. Cummings, widow of Frederick Cummings, late of Troop C, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William D. Craft, late of Company G, First Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas J. Reynolds, late of Troop D, First Regiment Ohio Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of John H. Henry, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 24, to strike out:

The name of Mary Michel, widow of John N. Michel, late a private Company A, Twelfth United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional for soldier's minor child until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 11, after the word "additional," to strike out "for each of soldier's minor children until they reach the age of 16 years" and insert "on account of each of the minor children of said John Fisher until they reach the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Rowena Fisher, widow of John Fisher, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said John Fisher until they reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of Charles W. Streeter, late corporal of Company F, Thirty-second Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Joseph Flewelling, late of Company E, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Seybold, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Walter E. Harris, late of United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 5, to strike out:

The name of Anna M. Neill, widow of Jesse A. Neill, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 14, after the words "Artillery Corps," to insert "Regular Establishment," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Adolf S. Szydlowski, late of Twenty-seventh Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of Frances T. Denton, widow of George W. Denton, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 22, after the word "Infantry," to strike out "old war," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary Conter, widow of John Conter, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 2, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$24" and insert "\$17," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William O'Bryan, late of Company B, Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 5, to strike out:

The name of Elizabeth C. Bell, widow of the late George H. Bell, quartermaster sergeant, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Simon P. Parrish, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Daniel P. Myers, late of Company I, First Regiment District of Columbia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Noel M. Pursley, late of Company F, Second Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Edwards, late of Battery C, Sixth Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 29, to strike out:

The name of Elizabeth A. Shull, widow of A. P. Shull, late second Lieutenant Capt. William Byrnes's company, First Brigade, Sixth Division California Militia, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 5, to strike out:

The name of John F. Mulhall, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lester D. Parkton, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment, and Company C, Twenty-seventh Regiment, United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of William C. Shaffer, late of Company H, Forty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Michael W. Hurley, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Benjamin F. Lamkin, late of Troop C, Third United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Fritz Hintermeier, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of Bridget Reynolds, widow of James C. Reynolds, who served in Company F, Thirty-fifth Regiment Michigan Infantry, and in Company H, Forty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month; also \$2 per month for each of the soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years.

The name of Donald E. Leslie, late of Company K, Sixteenth Pennsylvania Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Peter W. Weber, late of Company A, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteers, Mexican War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 31, to strike out:

The name of Jefferson C. Smith, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter L. Jewell, late of Troop B, Thirteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of Edward J. Oeding, late of Battery G, Sixth Regiment United States Artillery, and Thirteenth Battery United States Field Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Robert S. Peterson, late of Company B, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 10515.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10515) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENYON in the chair). Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. McCUMBER. I offer the amendments which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated. The first amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 1, after line 5, to strike out:

The name of James W. Hendrickson, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.



The name of Charles E. Kingsley, late of Troop E, First United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Brooks, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Michael W. Murphy, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Peter Black, late of the United States Navy, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dora F. Wilson, widow of Frederick Wilson, late of Troop B, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Miller, late of Companies C and K, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Philip Owen, late first lieutenant, Company L, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Walter C. Tharp, late of Company I, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 3, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent"; and, in line 5, after the words "National Guard," to insert "border defense," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary A. Johnson, dependent mother of Hilding C. Johnson, late of Company K, Second Regiment Minnesota Infantry, National Guard, border defense, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Peter F. Van Auken, late of Battery B, Sixth Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph E. Bivans, late of Battery A, First Regiment Illinois Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mrs. Eliza L. Ellis, daughter of William West, late of Captain M. Huntington's company, North Carolina Militia, War of 1812, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William B. Stroepe, late of Company E, First Regiment Arkansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of Fred F. Bennett, late of Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Kansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John E. Root, late of Troop A, Second Regiment, and Troop D, Eighth Regiment, United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Peter L. Johnson, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 19, after the word "Henry," to strike out "Parrish" and insert "Parish," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Henry Parish, late of Capt. William Cason's company, Florida Volunteers, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$20," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Nancy A. Meredith, widow of Frederick Meredith, late of Capt. Hall's company, Third Regiment Illinois Mounted Volunteers, Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Gus H. Weber, late of band, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Helen Cecilia Schaarman, mother of Frank L. Schaarman, alias Frank L. Sherman, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 17, after the word "Infantry," to insert "border defense," and in line 19, after the words "account of," to strike out "soldier's minor child until he shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "the minor child of said George Merz until he reaches the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Marie Merz, widow of George Merz, late of Company I, Seventy-first Regiment New York National Guard Infantry, border defense, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said George Merz until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of John D. Andrews, late of Company B, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment Indian Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 6, to strike out:

The name of William F. W. Gordon, late of Company G, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of Nellie L. Benton, widow of Francis Benton, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 8, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Margrethe Nelson, dependent mother of Henry R. Nelson, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 7, to strike out:

The name of George J. Cox, late of Company G, Thirty-first Regiment Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of Joseph F. Smith, late of Company E, Twenty-eighth United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred M. Graham, late of Company I, Third Regiment Virginia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary J. Beard, widow of John D. Beard, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of David J. Hanger, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 8, to strike out:

The name of James C. Claxton, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Bert B. Hughes, late of Battery B, First Regiment Maine Heavy Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Stephen Harder, late of Company D, Two hundred and second Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Robert E. McCormick, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, and Battery D, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Isabel Bertrand, widow of Joseph Bertrand, alias Abraham Magnus, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Islay T. Pittman, widow of George L. Pittman, late first lieutenant, Second Regiment North Carolina National Guard Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month and \$2 per month additional for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 6, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary Plummer (now Hill), dependent mother of Hiram L. Plummer, late of Company E, Twentieth Regiment Kansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 9, to strike out:

The name of Walter Sewell, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William Olday, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Nathaniel J. Smith, late of Troop L, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 22, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$20," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John Degen, late of Troop B, First United States Cavalry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Everett A. Dibble, late of Company I, Thirty-first Regiment Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Samuel A. Berry, late unassigned United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Wilks, late of Company E, Third Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin K. Wright, late of Company I, First Regiment West Virginia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 21, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Bridget Mulcahy, dependent mother of Michael Mulcahy, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 11, to strike out:

The name of John C. McDowell, late of Troop E, First Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Benjamin W. Clark, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harry W. Miller, late captain of Company C, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Charles L. C. Sherwin, late of Troop K, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 16, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Laura S. Gilkey, dependent mother of Charles T. Gilkey, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of Elmer S. Baker, late of Company L, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Walker, widow of George Walker, late of Company I, Second Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anton Casper, late of Company B, Third Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 7, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," and in line 10, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$25" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Christina R. Urquhart, dependent mother of William M. Urquhart, late of Company H, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Lee Toms, late of Company E, Twenty-third Regiment Kansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Catherine Millington, minor of Frank T. Millington, late of Troop C, Third United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$14 per month until she shall have reached the age of 16 years. Payment to be made to duly appointed guardian.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that that committee amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 12, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of Albert F. Knight, late of Company H, Third Regiment Nebraska Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Thomas H. Cox, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of Albert Yoder, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Missouri Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Mary Jane Graham, former widow of Thomas H. Frazier, late of Company A, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Jacob Hicks, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Leroy Dunn, late of Company C, Twenty-third United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Roscoe Schutt, late of Troop F, Third United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Robinson, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 17, to strike out:

The name of Pearl C. Holt, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Missouri Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of John M. Sexton, late of Company I, First Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Margaret A. Storie, widow of William C. Storie, late of Company C, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. V. Wiggins, late of Troop K, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edmund W. Roderick, late of Company H, Third Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 25, to strike out "for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "on account of each of the minor children of said George H. Burke until they reach the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary A. Burke, widow of George H. Burke, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said George H. Burke until they reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of Sarah Adaline Youngblood, widow of Michael Youngblood, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Louisiana Volunteers, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Kinne, widow of Sylvanus H. Kinne, late of Company A (Capt. T. Bond's), First Regiment Illinois Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George T. Keith, late of Company C, First Regiment Alabama Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Furfey, widow of Edward A. Furfey, late of Battery I, Seventh Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years.

The name of James Duffy, late of Company B, Thirty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 7, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary Jane King, dependent mother of Robert L. King, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 17, to strike out:

The name of Lafe Strickland, late of Company D, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. McGee, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fred A. Safford, late of Troop L, Third United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.



The name of George V. M. Sommerhauser, late of Troop M, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 13, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Maggie Gordon, dependent mother of Allen E. Gordon, late of Company K, Forty-ninth Regiment Iowa Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 19, to strike out:

The name of John A. Shaw, late of Company F, First Regiment Vermont Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Zadok K. Basden, late of Company I, First North Carolina Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Theodore L. Shaffer, late of Company I, Twentieth Regiment Kansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 4, before the word "father," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James H. Hook, dependent father of Edward R. Hook, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment Kansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of Tony K. Wilson, late hospital steward, Twelfth Regiment Minnesota Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that that amendment be rejected.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 19, after line 11, to strike out:

The name of Anna Kendrick, widow of Herbert N. Kendrick, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Minnesota Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Emma A. Esarey, mother of Clarence S. Carr, late of mounted service (white), United States Field Artillery; general service, United States Infantry; and Tenth Recruit Company, border defense, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 20, to strike out:

The name of Charles I. Meck, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Theresa Cloyd, widow of Stephen W. Cloyd, late of Company C, Second Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Teddy Sexton, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Murray R. Marshall, late of Company A, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stanford Holmes, late of Company B, First Regiment Indiana Colored Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harry L. Vance, late of Company M, First Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 1, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Jemima Grigg, dependent mother of George G. Grigg, late of Company F, Thirty-third Regiment Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 15, after the word "Infantry," to strike out "Regular Establishment" and insert "War with Spain," and, in line 16, after the words "rate of," to strike out "\$14 per month until she shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "\$12 per month and \$2 per month additional until she reaches the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Elsie Gardner, minor child of John T. Gardner, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional until she reaches the age of 16 years. Payment to be made to duly appointed guardian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 24, to strike out:

The name of Andrew H. Wegman, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 4, before the word "Captain," to strike out "who served in" and insert "late of," and, in line 6, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$25" and insert "\$20," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Martha E. Johnston, widow of Alfred H. Johnston, late of Captain Derrick's Company, Georgia Volunteers, Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of Mary A. Baldrige, former widow of George W. Berry, late of Company G, Second Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 23, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," and in line 26, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$20" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary C. Herrington, dependent mother of Lem R. Herrington, late of Company H, First Regiment West Virginia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of Martha Ann Welch, former widow of Robert A. Welch, late of the United States Navy, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 21, after the word "additional," to strike out "for each of the sailor's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "on account of each of the minor children of said James Kavanagh until they reach the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Grace Kavanagh, widow of James Kavanagh, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said James Kavanagh until they reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 24, to strike out:

The name of Abe Erlich, late of Company I, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Sarah B. Fuller, widow of Samuel L. Fuller, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emily E. McKee, widow of James A. McKee, late of Company E, Palmetto Regiment South Carolina Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have stated during this session that no pension bill could be defeated in the Senate. The action taken upon the numerous pension measures proves the truth of this statement. It is my purpose to demand full consideration in the future of all pension bills, particularly service pension bills, and to prevent by the use of all honorable means the passage of measures not meritorious.

I regret the lack of interest by Senators when measures of this kind are considered. Bills carrying tens of millions of dollars are passed with but few Senators in attendance, and fewer still familiar with their terms. A few days ago a \$65,000,000 pension bill was passed, and I doubt whether there were 10 Members of the Senate in the Chamber during the consideration of the bill. Other pension bills, carrying large amounts, have been presented for our consideration. They, too, have received no attention whatever at the hands of the overwhelming majority of the Senate. Whenever any bill is before us that calls for the expenditure of money, no one is in the Senate except those interested in that particular bill. There seem to be no opponents of expenditures. Advocates of appropriations are usually insistent upon action by Congress and are always active in urging consideration.

We have appropriated more than \$5,350,000,000 as pensions for the survivors of the Civil War. We appropriated last year more than \$327,000,000 for pensions. In my opinion, the appropriations for the coming fiscal year will aggregate more than

\$600,000,000, and if this Congress should remain in session for another 30 days I feel sanguine that appropriations for pensions will be swelled to the extent of over \$2,000,000,000.

There is pension madness in the Senate, in Congress, and among some public officials. There has been too little regard by the people in the past for the stupendous appropriations which have been made for pensions, but sooner or later there will be an awakening by the people. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] stated yesterday that pension bills would always pass because there were "votes in pensions," and that opposition to pensions would fail because there were no votes in the opposition. Already the people of the United States are beginning to feel the burdens of high taxes. When the subsidence in the business activity of the people of the United States manifests itself in a depleted if not a completely exhausted Treasury and new sources of taxation are resorted to, and the workingmen and the ultimate consumer are compelled to pay additional taxes, Congress shall be called upon to render an accounting for the extravagance and apparent profligacy which characterize our course.

Mr. President, we should deal liberally with those who in the service of their country were injured or incurred disabilities, and the widows and children of men who lost their lives when they were in the service of their country should be generously dealt with. The American people have manifested a desire to deal fairly with all entitled to pensions. But Congress has not always been satisfied with that character of appropriations—such appropriations that can be justified—that appeal to the sentiments of patriotism and justice.

We must now pension everybody whose name has been upon the rolls of the military or naval branches of the Government for 90 days. Indeed, Mr. President, we have modified that rule, and we passed a pension bill yesterday containing a large list of names of persons who had not served 90 days who were to be paid pensions. Under this new plan the rule and law are to be changed, and men who never had on a uniform, men who never were 50 miles away from their homes while in service, are to be pensioned for life if their names are upon the rolls, and that course is pursued even though there are no injuries or disabilities and the beneficiary is the possessor of wealth. There seems to be some who feel that a pension is an incorporeal hereditament; that it is something which may be transmitted from father to son and from grandson to great-grandson until, like property, it may be willed and alienated and devised and bequeathed without limitation.

I repeat, we are pension mad; we pension men who were never injured; we pension men who never suffered any disability; we pension men who are suffering no disabilities now; we pension men who are worth millions; we pension men who enjoy thousands and tens of thousands of dollars annually from their professions and from their business investments; this is the day of service pensions, and still more service pensions. No one knows what the end will be.

Mr. President, it has been said that the motto a few years ago of a certain political party was, "Hurrah for the old flag and for big appropriations." There were those in public station who seemed to be more interested in getting appropriations than they were in constructive policies which would make for the prosperity and welfare of the people. Are there not dangerous influences now pervading the land, which operate upon public officials, which seek public benefactions at the expense of the people?

I think it would be better for the country if, instead of passing indiscriminate and unworthy pension bills, we attempted to legislate for the people's welfare. If legislation is needed to punish those who create monopolies or profiteer and rob the people we should enact it. I have felt there was profiteering and combinations and conspiracies in restraint of trade and corporations which, by the exercise of great power, financial and otherwise, have oppressed the people and practiced extortion to an intolerable degree.

I was glad to read in this morning's paper that a number of men who have been vending goods, charging extortionate prices, making from 100 to 200 per cent profit upon the sales, have been prosecuted and punished. There are too many food profiteers; there are too many thieves and robbers in various parts of the land robbing and plundering the people, despoiling and exploiting because they have the power.

If additional legislation is required in order to reach existing evils and to send to the penitentiary those who are taking advantage of the necessities of the people, it will be far better that we enact it than to devour the people's substance by a system of high taxation.

But our good Republican friends who dominate both branches of Congress are spending money, and spending still more, notwithstanding the exhausted condition of the Treasury.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] to-day called attention to the billions of dollars which this Congress has appropriated. He did not state the aggregate, and he did not begin to state the entire amount which will be expended by this Congress during this session and which we will be compelled to meet in deficiency appropriation bills when the Congress shall be convened again.

No one knows where the money is to come from. We spend it, and spend regardless of the sources from which the taxes are to come. We will probably be forced to a bond issue if we continue this extravagance—a bond issue in a time of peace, a bond issue with more than \$6,000,000,000 of dollars expended and with between four and six billion dollars collected from the people in one year in taxation. Mr. President, this wild saturnalia of extravagance must cease. Those in public life must have due regard for the responsibilities which rest upon them. We should be the conservators of the interests of the people. We should protect the taxpayers. We should represent the public instead of the special interests and those who are knocking constantly at the door of the Congress for appropriations.

It is time that we should take stock, that we should determine our liabilities and our assets, and that we should inaugurate a policy of reform, a policy of economy, which will rescue this great Republic from financial collapse.

I sincerely hope that my friend the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], than whom there is no better man in public life, will in the future join with others in attempting to stem the great tide of extravagance and wastefulness which seems to be sweeping over the land.

I sincerely hope that we will have no more of these omnibus pension bills presented for our consideration, and that the pensions paid shall be for those who have suffered, those who have received disabilities, those who, in the great World War, have received wounds and injuries or nervous disabilities. The widows and dependents of those who died for their country, must be cared for and justice done to all.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there is a very old saying that if we take care of the pennies the dollars will take care of themselves. I commend the reverse of that to the Senate of the United States. If we will take care of the billions of dollars, the little hundreds of dollars in these little pension bills will probably take care of themselves. While we have been discussing this bill the cost of conducting Congress has probably been greater than the amounts involved in the bills we have been considering.

The Senator from Utah is in error if he thinks there is a single name upon these five bills which is for a service pension only. None of them are service pensions. Every one of them involves an injury incurred in line of service, and not one widow or helpless child is granted a pension under any one of these five bills unless it was established to the satisfaction of the committee that the injury was sustained in line of service.

The particular bill we are now discussing will involve about \$9,000, provided the recipients of the pensions live to the end of the year. The probabilities are that not many of them will remain on earth even that long.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator what, in his opinion, will be the aggregate amount paid by the Government of the United States for pensions for the coming fiscal year?

Mr. McCUMBER. The amount was reported, of course, with the pension appropriation bill. It will be about \$279,000,000.

Mr. KING. The Senator, of course, knows that in addition to that we have already appropriated nearly \$300,000,000—I am making no complaint with respect to that—and we will doubtless be compelled to appropriate large additional sums.

Mr. McCUMBER. We have been most liberal, Mr. President, with reference to the soldiers of the late war. We have been extraordinarily generous to their families.

Mr. KING. So the aggregate of the pensions for the coming fiscal year, if the Senator will pardon me, will be at least \$600,000,000—from that to \$800,000,000.

Mr. McCUMBER. Not of pensions.

Mr. KING. I mean for pensions and appropriations made to those who sustained injuries in the war.

Mr. McCUMBER. I can not estimate the amount which will be paid under the war-risk insurance, but it is most generous.

Mr. President, with reference to the objection which the Senator suggests he will urge to any more omnibus pension bills, I welcomed the Senator's assistance in the committee. He is a member of the Committee on Pensions. I wish the Senator would be present, after Congress reassembles, and assist me in



keeping a quorum. If the Senator then believes that the policy which we have followed, even before the Senator came on earth, with reference to these pensions ought to be changed, I will be most happy to go over it with him and to consider the whole question upon its merits; and I hope we will some time be able to keep a quorum of that committee to consider that very proposition.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 11554.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate as in Committee of the Whole proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11554) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for action on the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 1, after line 5, to strike out:

The name of John Whittington, late of Troop C, Eleventh Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 10, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Gussie Rash, dependent mother of Roy Degman, late of Company L, Forty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Asa C. Pieratt, late of Troop I, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Lambert, late of Company G, Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of John C. Ferneding, late of Company I, Third Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John A. Gaut, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Minnesota Infantry, and Company I, Thirty-ninth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Joseph B. Ohr, late of Company E, First Regiment Ohio Infantry, and Companies E and A, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to strike out:

The name of George W. Doney, late of Company C, First Brigade Oregon Mounted Militia, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Julius A. Fuhrman, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James Cunningham, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment, United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter S. Stewart, late of Company M, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 4, to strike out:

The name of David Dixon, late of Troop E, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of Oliver P. Jackson, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Missouri Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of Jonas Bolen, alias James Bolen, late of Troop B, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of William H. Culler, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Edward Gaines, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of George B. Locke, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to strike out:

The name of Christopher C. Ogden, late of Company K, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of Peter Poirier, late of Company B, Forty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of Peter F. O'Brien, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, and United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 11, to strike out:

The name of Frank Lynch, late of the Forty-eighth Company, United States Coast Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 19, to strike out:

The name of Alva C. Foster, late of Company C, Third Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Andrew R. Erb, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph D. Blackwell, late of Company I, Second Regiment West Virginia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Augustus W. Connor, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Thomas C. Nation, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 14, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Lucinda Wilson, dependent mother of Albert J. Wilson, late of Company H, Thirty-fifth Regiment Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Gustave Stellar, late of Company M, Ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of Harry Weinheimer, late of Company F, Forty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 7, to strike out:  
The name of Alfred Rivers, late of United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of John W. Oldfield, late of Company A, First Regiment West Virginia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William A. Zinn, late of Company H, Second Regiment West Virginia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John L. Dick, late of Company B, United States Engineers, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Warman, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, lines 1 to 6, to strike out:

The name of Miner N. Howard, late of Battery H, First Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Amel G. Johnson, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Iowa Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of David A. Turner, late of Company M, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Ricker, late of Company K, Third Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 22, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Della Moore, dependent mother of Charles W. Frazee, late of Troop A, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 4, after the words "per month," to strike out "with \$2 per month additional for soldier's minor child until he shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said William L. Huston until he reaches the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Ida C. Huston, widow of William L. Huston, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said William L. Huston until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Simon T. Hickman, late of Company C, First Battalion Engineers, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of John Scott, late of Troop K, Ninth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Sullivan, late of Company G, Thirty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Raleigh J. Stanberry, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain—

And on page 10, lines 1 to 9, to strike out:

and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Schrum, late of Company G, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles T. Pickens, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of Bascom M. Meyers, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 16, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary R. Mellinger, dependent mother of Walter A. Mellinger, late of Company A, Second Regiment Oregon Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 a month.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 19, to strike out:

The name of George W. Bales, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Louis H. Trayser, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 3, after the words "rate of," to strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James M. Pollock, late of Company H, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 8, after the word "month," to strike out "with \$2 per month additional for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said William Retter until they reach the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Katherine Retter, widow of William Retter, late of Troop D, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said William Retter until they reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of Jacob Imhoff, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert H. Sheaffer, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of John H. Franklin, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James M. Taylor, late of Company K, Second Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John E. Harris, late of Company G, Second Regiment Georgia Infantry, and Fourteenth Company United States Coast Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Daniel B. Klingensmith, late of United States Marine Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 23, after the word "month," to strike out "with \$2 per month additional for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Thomas L. Hanlon until they reach the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Emma S. Hanlon, widow of Thomas L. Hanlon, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Thomas L. Hanlon until they reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of William Fussnecker, late of Company H, Third Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 9, to strike out:

The name of William Constable, late of Company I, Second Regiment West Virginia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Nicholas Sharp, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 19, after the word "month," to strike out "with \$2 per month additional for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Willis A. Ward



until they reach the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Margaret E. Ward, widow of Willis A. Ward, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Willis A. Ward until they reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 23, and in lines 1 and 2, page 14, to strike out:

The name of Otis O. Milliken, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Charles A. Bills, alias Frank Button, late of Company K, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas Cavalry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Jacob Lyons, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 11, before the words "United States," to insert "Fifth Regiment," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Thomas N. Pray, late of Troop D, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of Albert Beiro, late of Company G, Second Wisconsin Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of James K. Vance, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 3, after the words "rate of," to strike out "\$20" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John Kerns, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of Samuel C. Braden, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas A. Puyear, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 22, after the word "additional," to strike out "for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "on account of each of the minor children of said Lloyd D. Witters until they reach the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Anna L. Witters, widow of Lloyd D. Witters, late of Company D, Twenty-first United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Lloyd D. Witters until they reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Oliver Hull, late of United States Marine Corps, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Jerry Fitzpatrick, late of Company K, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of William Wade, late of Battery D, Fourth United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Rachel Ann Toolil, widow of Joseph Toolil, late of Company B, Third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, lines 1, 2, and 3, to strike out:

The name of Harry H. Rokey, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of Walker Anderson, late of Troop A, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of James E. Johnson, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 11, to strike out:

The name of Emma R. Foster, widow of Benjamin Foster, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 21, after the words "rate of," to strike out "\$24" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Albert O. McNulty, late of Company G, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of Nancy G. West, late a contract nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, lines 1, 2, and 3, to strike out:

The name of Phillip Ausmus, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of Clara J. Sitton, widow of Felix J. Sitton, late of Company H, First Regiment Doniphan's Missouri Mounted Volunteer Infantry, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 11, after the words "rate of," strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Murray Pierce, late of Company L, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of Earl Sanders, late of Company M, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 20, after the words "rate of," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$20," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Sarah A. Boorman, widow of Elbertus A. Boorman, late of Battery K, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of Johanna Murphy, mother of Frank J. Murphy, late of Supply Company, Ninth Infantry, Massachusetts National Guard, border defense, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, lines 1 to 7, to strike out:

The name of Richard M. Gilbert, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Cary M. Carlton, late of Company G, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 11, to strike out:

The name of William C. Jacobs, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of James H. St. Clair, late of Company H, Third Regiment Georgia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 20, to strike out:

The name of James D. Smith, alias James Smith, late of Troop F, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of Thomas E. Sutton, alias Birt Sutton, late of Company C, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of Henry Blankenship, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Ohio Infantry, and Company F, Fortieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 11, to strike out:

The name of Charles H. Helmlich, alias Charles H. Henderson, late of Company E, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of Alfred N. Oakleaf, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Ohio Infantry, and Company K, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 19, to strike out:

The name of Minnie Nordyke, widow of Edward C. Nordyke, late of Troop L, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 24, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Louisa Baumgard, dependent mother of William Baumgard, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Hugh Hoch, late of Company M, Twenty-first Regiment Kansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 9, after the words "rate of," to strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William N. King, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, and One hundred and tenth Company, Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 14, after the word "additional," to strike out "for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years," and insert "on account of each of the minor children of said Carl King until they reach the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Venus B. King, widow of Carl King, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Carl King until they reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 17, to strike out:

The name of Augustus Thompson, late of Company H, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Engineers, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank F. Pittman, late of Company F, First Regiment Arkansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 9, to strike out:

The name of Brice Selby, late of One hundred and twentieth Company, United States Coast Artillery, and Battery M, Fourth United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 13, to strike out:

The name of Albert A. Lyke, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Corwin W. Holibaugh, late of Troop C, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 19, to strike out:

The name of Edith Payne Trimm, widow of Edmund W. Trimm, late chaplain Third Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 23, to strike out:

The name of James N. Davis, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Robert W. Koontz, late of Company M, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Renshall, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert M. Kuppel, late of Company C, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Peter Kankiewicz, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment, and Companies I and M, Fourteenth Regiment, United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of John C. Kulpman, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 2, after the word "additional," to strike out "for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "on account of each of the minor children of said Charles C. Cooper until they reach the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Maude C. Cooper, widow of Charles C. Cooper, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Charles C. Cooper until they reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 5, to strike out:

The name of Lewis A. Boone, late of Company E, Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 13, after the word "receiving," to insert "to continue," and in line 14, after the word "helplessness," to strike out "pension to be paid to duly appointed guardian," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Helen Fitton, blind and helpless child of John Fitton, late of the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, to continue during the period of her helplessness.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of Mike Cattarini, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ralph Erwin, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.



The next amendment was, on page 24, line 24, after the word "Lefavor," to strike out "retired, late of the United States Navy" and insert "late lieutenant United States Navy, retired," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Lizzie C. Lefavor, widow of Frederic H. Lefavor, late lieutenant United States Navy, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of George Crago, late of Company A, Thirty-first United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of David R. Locke, late of Company E, Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 10, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Catherine Summers, dependent mother of Lawrence Summers, late of Company L, Second Regiment Mississippi Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of William Holt, late of Company L, Thirty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Frank Godar, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of May A. Sanders, widow of William J. Sanders, late of Company F, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years.

The name of Jacob Cain, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John O. McMahon, late of Company F, Thirty-third Regiment Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 19, to strike out:

The name of Conrad H. Rowe, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alice Barkley, widow of Andrew J. Barkley, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Walter G. Smith, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Massachusetts Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 13, after the words "rate of," to strike out "\$35" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Jean R. Anderson, widow of Keller Anderson, late colonel, Second Regiment Tennessee Infantry, and major, Forty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 18, after the word "month," to strike out "with \$2 per month additional for each of soldier's minor children until they shall have reached the age of 16 years" and insert "and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Walter S. Hall, alias Walter McLaughlin, until they reach the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Annie G. Hall, widow of Walter S. Hall, alias Walter McLaughlin, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Walter S. Hall, alias Walter McLaughlin, until they reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 23, to strike out:

The name of George W. Rabel, late of the Twenty-eighth Battery Indiana Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Brown, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles C. Chilson, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 9, to strike out:

The name of Margaret Huling, widow of John Huling, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 15, after the word "Army," to strike out "Indian war" and insert "Regular Establishment," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Hester Walk, widow of Henry Walk, late of General Mounted Service, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 17, to strike out:

The name of Edward C. Wait, late of Company G, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Bert M. Dorton, late of Battery K, Third Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 1, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Maria Gaines, dependent mother of Albert Gaines, late of Company C, Second Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of Hans R. Jacobson, late of Company A, Second Regiment Oregon Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Wesley Priest, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harry S. Stahl, late of Company K, Fifty-first Regiment Iowa Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of Frank M. Preston, late of Company M, Third Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank S. Schmidt, late of Company F, Two hundred and second Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Walter C. Hathaway, late of Troop I, Fourteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Louise Shout, widow of John W. Shout, late of Troop C, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Rhoda M. Gates, former widow of Woodson Clay Gates, late of Capt. Hunter's and Miller's First Regiment Tennessee Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 15, before the word "mother," to insert "dependent," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Nancy Jane Howard, dependent mother of James Howard, late of Troop G, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 19, to strike out:

The name of Thomas Flinchum, late of Company C, Thirty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Mary S. Wilson, widow of Joshua Wilson, late of Company I, First Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 31, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Christopher L. Einkopf, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and Company G, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of Jane Polsgrove, widow of Almus W. Polsgrove, late of Company B, Second Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eugene P. Williams, late of Company L, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Daniel Burkey, late of Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 32, to strike out:

The name of James S. Haggard, late of Company C, Ninth Battalion Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Joseph Tewell, late of Company B, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Ivar A. Amell, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Jean B. Kopf, late of Troop B, First Regiment Illinois Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert Hand, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John B. A. Richard, late of Company D, First Regiment Rhode Island Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alvis F. Ritter, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Missouri Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, in lines 1 to 16, to strike out:

The name of Harvey L. Williams, late of Company A, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Engineers, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Simeon H. Johnston, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment United States Artillery, and Twelfth and Twenty-second Batteries United States Field Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of La Barron T. Marshall, late of Company F, Second Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Charles S. Kinman, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of William H. Fish, late of Company K, Fiftieth Regiment Iowa Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Horace B. Case, late of Company A, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter Barbo, late of Company I, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of Edward C. Crawford, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Joseph Phillips, late of Company H, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Heiland, late of Company B, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Leonidas Duncan, late of Company I, Forty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Joseph Dole, late of Troop B, First Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 19, after the word "Navy," to insert "War with Spain," and in line 20, after the word "month," to strike out "with \$2 per month additional for each of sailor's minor children until they reach the age of 16 years" and insert "and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said James J. Reid until they reach the age of 16 years," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Bridget E. Reid, widow of James J. Reid, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said James J. Reid until they reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, in lines 1 to 8, to strike out:

The name of Mary M. Newman, widow of John R. Newman, late captain Company K, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said John R. Newman until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 11, to strike out:

The name of Mary Brown, widow of Alexander Brown, late of Capt. Kelly's independent company, Florida Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hector H. Bryant, late of Troop B, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Charles Knight, late of Company K, First Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Theresa Brisbois, widow of Gabriel A. Brisbois, late of Knowlton's independent company, Wisconsin Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John E. Collins, late acting hospital steward, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Grunert, late of Company L, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Hugh O. Neville, late of Troop F, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel G. Dinsmore, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 4, after the words "rate of," to strike out "\$25" and insert "\$20," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Cynthia Martin, widow of James L. Martin, late of Captain Tedford's company, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteers, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving. Payment to be made to duly appointed guardian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of George A. Cooper, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Susanah Raines, mother of William R. Raines, late of Company M, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, border defense, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles A. Rogers, late of Company A, Third Regiment Missouri Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of Lewis W. Taft, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 21, after the word "Army," to insert "Regular Establishment," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John F. Dile, late unassigned recruit, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 23, to strike out:

The name of Guy Robison, late of the Sixty-sixth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Lucy E. Blue, dependent mother of Arthur Blue, late of Company D, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary Stewart, widow of Robert W. Stewart, late of Starbuck's company, Second Illinois Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.



The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEAMSHIP "MATOA"—SCHOONER "HENRY O. BARRETT."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House to S. Con. Res. 26, which were—

That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives in signing the enrolled bill (S. 1005) "for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Matoa*" be, and hereby is, rescinded, and that the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, directed to reenroll said bill with an amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause of said bill and insert the following in lieu thereof: "That the claim of the owner of the steamship *Matoa* arising out of a collision between said steamship and the United States tug *Lucille Ross* off Lambert Point, Va., on the 17th day of January, 1918, for and on account of the losses alleged to have been suffered in said collision by the owner of said steamship *Matoa* by reason of damages to and detention of said steamship may be submitted to the United States Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, under and in compliance with the rules of said court sitting as a court of admiralty; and that the said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the whole controversy and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of the legal damages sustained by reason of said collision, if any shall be found to be due, either for or against the United States upon the same principle and measure of liability, with costs as in like cases in admiralty between private parties, with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That such notice of the suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by order of the said court; and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suit shall be brought and commenced within four months of the date of the passage of this act."

That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives in signing the enrolled bill (S. 1222) "for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett*" be, and hereby is, rescinded, and that the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, directed to reenroll said bill with an amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause of said bill and insert the following in lieu thereof: "That the claim of the owners of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett* arising out of a collision between said schooner and the United States monitor *Ozark*, off Five Fathom Bank Lightship, on the 19th day of April, 1917, for and on account of the losses alleged to have been suffered in said collision by the owners of said schooner *Henry O. Barrett* by reason of damages to and detention of said schooner, may be submitted to the United States court for the district of Massachusetts, under and in compliance with the rules of said court sitting as a court of admiralty; and that the said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the whole controversy and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of the legal damages sustained by reason of said collision, if any shall be found to be due either for or against the United States, upon the same principle and measure of liability, with costs, as in like cases in admiralty between private parties, with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That such notice of the suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by order of the said court; and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suit shall be brought and commenced within four months of the date of the passage of this act."

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### MOUNT ALTO HOSPITAL.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I realize in these closing hours of the session how urgent and important many measures are that are proposed to be brought before the Senate this evening. I shall satisfy my ambition by stating my case very plainly. I simply ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 13627) to amend paragraph (e) of section 7 of the act approved March 3, 1919, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," may be considered at this time. I had expected to ask for the consideration of two bills, one of them carrying an appropriation of about \$10,000,000 for hospitals for the soldiers.

This bill passed the House unanimously, providing for a hospital in this city in which there are to-day 125 soldiers. An act was passed on the 3d day of March, 1919, carrying an appropriation of \$9,000,000 for the building of hospitals, but a provision in the act stated that the hospitals must be located on land owned by the Government. No land in the city could be found suitable, however, that was owned by the Government, but a piece of land of 11 acres with buildings upon it was leased for a time, and it can now be purchased. Members of a subcommittee have examined the property and have estimated that the purchase would be a splendid bargain.

This is no new appropriation. It is simply to make available an appropriation already made of about \$550,000. I can not conceive that there will be any objection to the consideration of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the law itself. I think the Senator will admit that there is a proposed expenditure of money out of an appropriation, first, of \$250,000; second, of \$154,000; and, third, of \$6,000.

The bill proposes to amend the act approved March 3, 1919, and authorizes the expenditure of \$550,000 for the purchase of land and buildings of the National School of Domestic Art and Science, located at 2650 Wisconsin Avenue, in the District of Columbia, now under lease to the United States Government as a hospital. We refer to section 7, paragraph (e) of the act of March 3, 1919, and see that this is how it reads:

(e) The sum of \$550,000 is hereby authorized for the construction, on land owned by the Government, on a site to be selected by the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President, of a hospital plant complete in the District of Columbia or vicinity.

That is all of that paragraph. In the bill, on page 2, line 5, there is a proviso which reads as follows:

*Provided further*, That in addition to the \$550,000 hereby authorized the sum of \$250,000 from the amount appropriated by section 5 of the act hereby amended and of \$6,000 and of \$154,000 from the amounts appropriated by section 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, respectively, of said act, are hereby made available for the above-mentioned purposes and shall remain available until expended.

Section 5 of the act reads as follows:

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to contract with any existing hospital or sanatorium, by lease or otherwise, for immediate use, in whole or in part, of their present facilities, so as to provide bed capacity and facilities for not exceeding 1,000 patients, and for such purposes the sum of \$300,000 is hereby authorized.

So we take \$250,000 of that \$300,000 to be used for this particular purpose in addition to the \$555,000 that was appropriated in the act of March 3, 1919, and of \$6,000 and of \$154,000 of the amount appropriated by section 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, respectively, of the act. When we turn to the act we find that section 6, paragraph 1, reads as follows:

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, if in his judgment the same will be for the best interests of the Government from the standpoint of cost, location, and of the emergency needs of the Public Health Service, to purchase the site, buildings, and hospital facilities and appurtenances at Corpus Christi, Tex., known as General Hospital No. 15, and for such purpose the sum of \$150,000 is hereby authorized.

The second paragraph reads as follows:

The sum of \$1,500,000 is hereby authorized to be held as an emergency fund for the purchase of land and buildings suitable for hospital and sanatoria purposes, which the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to select and locate, and to make additions and improvements suitable to adapt them to the uses of the United States Public Health Service, if in his judgment the emergency requires it.

If we pass this bill, it means that the \$550,000 appropriated in section 7, paragraph (e), of the act of March 3, 1919, shall be used for this purpose. That paragraph specifically states that the purchase price of the land and buildings shall not exceed \$460,000 of the \$550,000.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, does the Senator wish to ask any questions? If not, I can not yield further at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. FERNALD. I yielded for a question.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not mean to say that I can not speak on this question?

Mr. FERNALD. Not at all; but in my own time I do not think that I ought to yield any longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state the situation. The Chair submitted the request for unanimous consent and then recognized the Senator from Utah. He now has the floor.

Mr. FERNALD. I thought I had the floor. If I am in error, I beg the Senator's pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will proceed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KING. I inquire whether or not it is the understanding of the Chair that unanimous consent has been granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not. The question is whether there is objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to conclude my statement, and then the question as to whether or not unanimous consent shall be granted may be decided. The Senator made the statement that this bill did not carry any appropriation. I wish to say to the Senator, with all due respect to his statement, that if we spend \$154,000 for this particular purpose in buying the building and lands, as is provided in this bill, there is not any doubt that just as soon as the \$1,500,000 is expended for the purpose for which it was originally appropriated Congress will be asked to appropriate to cover the \$154,000. That is just as certain as that the sun will rise to-morrow morning. Not only that, but it is just as certain as we live that the request will be granted.

I desire to make this statement in order that, if we take this bill up, there may be no misunderstanding as to its carrying an appropriation, but I will admit that it is taken out of the fund which was appropriated for a specific purpose. When that purpose is undertaken to be accomplished and it is found that there is not available the amount of money which was appropriated for it, the excuse will be offered here in the Senate Chamber, as well as in the other House, "Why, Congress intended to give us \$300,000; Congress intended to give us \$1,500,000; but an emergency arose, and we used a part of that appropriation, and now, of course, to carry out the will and wish of Congress, we have got to have an appropriation to make up that which has already been taken out."

It may be that this is a splendid purpose, as the Senator says; I do not know, for I have not the knowledge of the value of land out on Wisconsin Avenue; I do not know what the value of the building is; I can not say as to that; but if it is so valuable, let us distinctly understand that if we purchase it we are now making an appropriation that will have to be taken from a fund that has already been provided and will have to be replaced at some time in the future. That is all I wish to say about the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Reserving the right to object, I desire to say that I am not satisfied with the wisdom or the propriety of this appropriation.

Mr. FERNALD. Do I understand the Senator from Utah objects?

Mr. KING. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. FERNALD. I should like to make a statement. I regret at this late hour to be obliged to have to go into a matter of this kind in great detail. I am quite surprised at the attitude of Senators regarding this bill. The Public Buildings and Grounds Committee have had submitted to it something like 120 bills during the present session of Congress. Not a single bill has been reported favorably that carried a dollar of appropriation. I think that statement will answer any charge of extravagance on the part of the committee. We had a bill presented calling for an appropriation of \$87,000,000 for hospitals for the soldiers. After a careful examination, it was found that 640,000 invalid and disabled soldiers returned from France; that inside of two years it would require 23,400 beds to take care of those soldiers; and that it would entail an expense of nearly \$100,000,000 in the next six years. That bill was very carefully considered. We wrote to all of the soldiers' homes in the country to ascertain if there could not be quite a number of soldiers taken care of there. After they had all reported, we found that about 10,000 soldiers could be so taken care of.

Then another bill was introduced providing for an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for hospitals throughout the country. I was rather of the opinion that that bill ought to be passed, but it is a Senate bill, and I find at this late hour that it would be impossible to get it through and have it become a law during this session. So I decided not to say anything about that bill to-night; but the bill for which I ask consideration does not ask for any extra appropriation and is the only bill that has been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds providing for any money at all.

It may be true, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has stated, that there will be \$154,000 which it will be necessary to appropriate, but, Mr. President, suppose it does require \$154,000?

From the beginning of this session to the present time we have been talking about doing something for the soldier. We have listened to-night to a criticism of pensions for the boys who fought to save the flag, and we have been told that we were wasting money on pensions all over the country. Every one of the Senators who has mentioned this matter has stated that we ought to take care of the invalid soldiers; that if any men had been disabled, if any men had become blind or halt or lame, they should be cared for. I am frank to say—and I believe that every Senator here will bear me out in the statement—that all the letters that have been received from the business men and the American Legion in various parts of the country in opposition to the bonus have stated that the invalid soldiers ought to be cared for.

In this bill there is a provision that a hospital shall be founded in this city. Now, I wish to refer to the provisions of the original act. The then Secretary of the Treasury [Mr. Glass] called attention to the act appropriating \$9,000,000 for the purposes indicated by its title. I refer especially to the following provision:

The sum of \$550,000 is hereby authorized for the construction on land owned by the Government—

That is the difficulty—"on land owned by the Government," on a site to be selected by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, of a hospital plant, complete, in the District of Columbia or vicinity.

No land could be found in the District of Columbia which was considered by the Secretary of the Treasury suitable for this purpose; but the land on Wisconsin Avenue, consisting of about 11 acres, on which buildings were already erected capable of taking care of 125 men, was leased last year and is still under lease to the Government. It is proposed to buy that land. The Senator from Utah says he does not know anything about its value. Neither do I know anything about its value; I have not been there; and I do not know much about the value of property in Washington; but a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House have visited the location, have made an investigation, and have reported that it is a good bargain. I am certain that 11 acres in the city of Washington ought to be worth at least what is contemplated paying for this land and the buildings now erected on it.

Mr. President, we have started in, as I have said, to do something for the soldier; every Senator who has spoken on the matter to-night has said that we ought to take care of the invalid soldier. I can not understand why this great Government of ours is not willing to take care of the wounded soldiers whom one meets upon the streets. There are individuals in this city who do a thousand times more than they ought to be called upon to do to afford suitable protection and care for the men in hospitals.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FERNALD. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. How many wounded soldiers are in this hospital which it is proposed to buy?

Mr. FERNALD. There are 125 men there now.

Mr. SMOOT. Are the beds full?

Mr. FERNALD. I do not know about that; but 125 men are reported to be there.

Mr. SMOOT. The Government is leasing the building and paying the rent for it, is it not?

Mr. FERNALD. I presume so.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, we are taking care of the soldiers there, are we not?

Mr. FERNALD. Yes; but we have got to take care of more than 125.

Mr. SMOOT. Are there more beds than 125 there?

Mr. FERNALD. We propose to make the buildings larger, so that they will be able to care for 500 men.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that there is no report upon the bill and no report has been submitted to accompany it, as I understand. The bill is on the calendar here with no information except the appropriation which it contains, and that is all I can judge by.

Mr. FERNALD. If I can have an hour or two I think I can satisfy the Senate that it is quite necessary to do something for these boys.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think the Senator meant to say that, for we are leasing the property to-day and the Government has just as much use of it to-day as if they bought it. The only question is the propriety of appropriating \$460,000 for it, an additional sum of \$250,000, and then a further sum of \$154,000. If we are utilizing that property to-day and soldiers are being taken care of there, they are being taken just as good care of as if the Government owned the property.

I say the only question involved is: Do we want to appropriate this money and pay for the property outright, or do we want to lease the property, as we are doing to-day? That is a question as to which, as I have said, I am not able to judge, in view of the fact that no report whatever has been submitted. It may be the very best thing in the world to buy the property; I do not know; but as I have already said, the question of a failure to take care of the soldier boys is not involved in this bill at all, for they are being taken care of under the lease of the property just as well as they would be taken care of if it were purchased.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, they are taking care of soldiers to the extent of the capacity of the buildings, but they will care for only 125 men. There is, however, plenty of land there to enlarge the buildings, as was proposed in the original bill, so that 500 men may be taken care of.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FERNALD. I yield.



Mr. SPENCER. May I ask the Senator from Maine if that is the property that is about two or three blocks south of where Massachusetts Avenue runs into Wisconsin Avenue, upon the west side?

Mr. FERNALD. I think it is; it is called Mount Alto. It is one of the most beautiful spots in the city and one of the highest.

Mr. SPENCER. Oh, yes. That is the home where those soldiers who appear to be incurable are now cared for.

Mr. FERNALD. I understand so.

Mr. SPENCER. May I say to the Senator that I have been there, and my understanding is, from what I saw there, that the Government is now putting buildings upon that leased land, which it would seem to me, for economy's sake, is an unwise thing to do. If we are going to increase the building upon that land, the wise thing to do would be to buy the land and not to put buildings upon land that is leased.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SPENCER. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree with the Senator from Missouri. It is unthinkable that any department of the Government, in the face of a direct law saying that they can not do it, would go on and erect buildings on leased land. Now, when they are erecting the buildings, they come here to Congress and ask that we purchase the land. They do that after they have started the buildings. What they ought to have done was to come to Congress and have the purchase of the land authorized before they began the construction.

I want to ask the Senator from Missouri if the bill that he introduced, in which the consent of Congress, or at least the consent of the Senate, was given to buy certain lands out near the Walter Reed Hospital, became a law? I do not know whether it passed the House or not.

Mr. SPENCER. It did.

Mr. SMOOT. And that has nothing whatever to do with this matter?

Mr. SPENCER. Nothing whatever.

Mr. SMOOT. This is a new site?

Mr. SPENCER. Yes; it is entirely different.

Mr. SMOOT. The appropriation was made for \$550,000 originally, but that money was to be expended on Government-owned land. I do not see, however, that the Public Health Service is different from almost any other department of the Government. As I said here the other day, they pay no more attention to the laws of Congress, when they desire to do otherwise, than they would to the whistling of the wind.

Mr. FERNALD. The Senator from Utah knows that nobody has followed him in that respect more carefully than the Senator from Maine.

Mr. SMOOT. I am aware of it.

Mr. FERNALD. I have endeavored, in every vote I have cast here, to look upon the matter from a business standpoint and to act in an economical way; but I do believe that we ought to make provision for these men.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERNALD. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator, for information, why it is that these buildings that were put up to house the soldiers in the city of Washington and at different encampments can not be used for hospitals?

For instance, down on the Speedway here we have perhaps 30 or 40 or 50 buildings that are capable of housing at least five or six hundred persons, I should judge, if not a thousand. They are empty and rotting. Now, why could not they be utilized for hospitals? I do not know anything about their structure, but why could not they be used?

Mr. FERNALD. I think, in reply to that question, that there are many of the buildings that are to be used in the near future for hospital purposes, but those buildings would hardly be fit. They are not suitably constructed.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill. Senators have been discussing for the last three-quarters of an hour, I think, the merits of the bill. If it is proper to call for the regular order, and submit the question as to whether or not unanimous consent shall be given, I should like to invoke that rule. We are debating the question upon the request of the Senator from Maine for unanimous consent.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FERNALD. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that so far as I am concerned, from what I have learned as to the value of the land, if it is there, I shall not object; and the bill can be considered now, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state the situation. The question was submitted. The junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] reserved the right to object and consented to hear the Senator from Maine. The Senator from Maine was explaining the object of the bill, with the consent of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Maine one question.

We have a number of cantonments with splendid hospital facilities already connected with them that the War Department has determined to keep. There are hospital facilities that would accommodate more than 10,000 men in these cantonments, where we own the land and own additional buildings sufficient to take care of over a million men. Can the Senator tell me why those hospitals and those grounds are not used, instead of buying new ones?

I ask the question in all seriousness, because it has just occurred to me. I thought I was for the Senator's bill, because I am in favor of taking care of these men; but I know that at most of these cantonments that the Government owns and proposes to keep—it has asked to keep eight, and I think Congress has approved its keeping eight—there are hospitals that will take care of from 1,500 to 2,500 men, splendidly equipped, with all sanitary arrangements.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I quite agree with the Senator from Georgia, and that is the reason why the appropriation bills calling for \$87,000,000 and \$10,000,000 have not been favorably reported; but in this city there are no buildings, I think, that are large enough or would be able to accommodate the men that are here. The buildings referred to by the Senator from South Dakota would be large enough or nearly so, but they are not suitable for that purpose, and the Senator from Maine believes that with the cantonments about the country and the soldiers' homes a large number of the 23,000 men that it will be necessary to care for in the near future can be cared for. In this city, however, there is not sufficient hospital room to-day.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia and Mr. KING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERNALD. I yield, first, to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, is it necessary to have them in Washington? Are not many of these cantonments in much better all-around-the-year climates?

Mr. FERNALD. The Secretary of the Treasury reported that it was necessary. In a letter under date of December 5, 1919, Hon. Carter Glass, Secretary of the Treasury, addressed a communication to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in relation to additional hospital facilities for discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, and Army officers. The Secretary's letter was printed as a House document in the Sixty-sixth Congress, second session. In that communication the Secretary informed Congress that it would be necessary to make provision for 23,400 beds within the next two years and that the total cost would be \$85,000,000.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FERNALD. I yield.

Mr. SPENCER. May I say, in part answer, because perhaps it fits in at this time, that my understanding is that this hospital at Mount Alto is not a general hospital. It is a hospital that is intended solely for those who, for one reason or another, are deemed to be incurable. Therefore my information is that the Medical Department feels that that hospital must be located in a place where not only the General Staff will be available, but it must be contiguous to the specialists in every form of critical cases, which would be impossible in a general cantonment. It must be located somewhere in a center of medical knowledge, and I think that is one of the reasons why they felt that it must be located in a city like Washington. My understanding is that there are no cases at this place except those cases of the unfortunate character that I have described.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. FERNALD. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And as the surgical specialists of the Army are largely here, they deem this the desirable place?

Mr. SPENCER. Such is my information.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I want to say to the Senator from Maine that I was not seeking to criticize but to obtain information.

Mr. FERNALD. Certainly; I realize that.

I should like to give a little more information, because we have a letter not only from the former Secretary of the Treasury but from the present Secretary of the Treasury. If the Senator cares for further information, I shall be glad to read it; but if there is no objection—I know how anxious other Senators are to take up other matters, and I am willing to submit the question at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13627) to amend paragraph (e) of section 7 of the act approved March 3, 1919, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That paragraph (e) of section 7 of the act approved March 3, 1919, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) The sum of \$550,000 is hereby authorized for the purchase of the land and buildings of the National School of Domestic Arts and Science, located at 2650 Wisconsin Avenue, in the District of Columbia, now under lease to the United States Government as a hospital, and for the construction of such additions and improvements thereto as may be necessary to suitably adapt them to the needs and purposes of the Public Health Service: *Provided*, That the purchase price of said land and buildings shall not exceed \$460,000: *Provided further*, That in addition to the \$550,000 hereby authorized, the sum of \$250,000 from the amount appropriated by section 5 of the act hereby amended and of \$6,000 and of \$154,000 from the amounts appropriated by section 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, respectively, of said act, are hereby made available for the above-mentioned purposes and shall remain available until expended."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WARREN. I present the conference report on the general deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming presents a conference report, which will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14335) "making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 5, 8, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 26, 37, 39, 50, and 60.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 22, 24, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, and 58; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

#### "ANTHRACITE COAL COMMISSION.

"The unexpended balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1920 for the Bituminous Coal Commission is made available during the fiscal years 1920 and 1921 for expenses of the Anthracite Coal Commission, including salaries and expenses of officers, employees, and witnesses, personal services in the District of Columbia, purchase of supplies, printing and binding, reporting proceedings, per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4, and all other necessary expenses in connection therewith."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "the passage of this act" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1920"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and roadway thereto, \$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an

amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

#### "SHIPPING BULLETIN.

"The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to cause to be prepared in the office of communications, Navy Department, a publication known as the Shipping Bulletin, and to publish and furnish the same to the maritime interests of the United States and other interested parties, at the cost of collecting and publishing the information, including the cost of printing and paper and other necessary expenses. The expenses of such bulletin shall be paid from the appropriation 'Engineering,' Bureau of Steam Engineering, fiscal year 1921. The money received from the sale of such publication shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

#### "PENSION OFFICE.

"To provide additional compensation for employees of the Bureau of Pensions designated to carry out the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, \$2,000, to continue available until June 30, 1921: *Provided*, That no person so employed shall receive compensation at a rate exceeding \$1,740 per annum except one at \$3,000, one at \$2,400, one at \$2,000, and two at \$1,800 each."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$20" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That paper, envelopes, and blank books required by the stationery rooms of the Senate and House of Representatives for sale to Senators and Members for official use may be purchased from the Public Printer at actual cost thereof and payment therefor shall be made before delivery"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out, in lines 2 and 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, the words "or before October 1 of each year" and insert in lieu thereof "the first day of each regular session"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by said amendment lines 69, 70, 71, 72, 76, 77, 78, and 79, and in line 103 strike out "\$863,568.91" and insert in lieu thereof "\$854,735.49"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "5," and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 4 and 18.

F. E. WARREN,

CHAS. CURTIS,

O. W. UNDERWOOD,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

JAMES W. GOOD,

J. G. CANNON,

JAMES F. BYRNES,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report just submitted by him. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to say the report is a complete agreement except as to two items, and as to those two items it will require some further time for their consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.



Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments still in disagreement, ask for a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. One moment. If the Chair will allow me to make a suggestion, we do not desire a further conference.

Mr. WARREN. I understood the Senator to wish otherwise. My first idea was to ask for the acceptance of the report and to let it lie on the table, but it has to be somewhere in the interim.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I think, if the chairman will allow me—

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We have agreed to a conference report which covers all of the items but two; one is the school item, and the other is the item in reference to claims for the levy improvements, an item which was discussed here. Those two items are still in dispute. I will suggest to the chairman that I think the direct method of bringing the matter to a vote in the House would be merely to move that the Senate further insist on those two amendments and send the matter to the House. That would bring a direct vote without asking for a further conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. WARREN. That sends the papers at once to the House. That is the intention.

Mr. LODGE. Yes, that is correct.

#### CLAIMS ON SHORE WATERS IN ALASKA.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a favorable report from the Committee on Territories, and ask immediate consideration of the bill. I do not think it will encounter any opposition or call for any discussion. If it appears that it calls for any prolonged discussion, I will withdraw it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NEW. I do.

Mr. KING. Does this relate to the Hawaiian lands?

Mr. NEW. Not at all.

Mr. KING. I had hoped that the Senator's committee, or some other, would report the measure which passed the House dealing with the Hawaiian lands.

Mr. NEW. I only regret that that is impossible.

This bill, Mr. President, is simply this: When the homestead laws were extended to Alaska a provision was made that no two homesteads should be located along any shore or navigable water except with a space of 80 rods between the two, and that no homestead should be permitted to be entered that extended for more than 160 rods along the shore. Now, Mr. President, the shore lines of Alaska are more than 26,000 miles in extent, and if you add to that the banks of the navigable streams of Alaska, they perhaps are of equal length; so that it really has the effect of exempting 50,000 miles of shore and stream line there from homestead entry. It has been found by the department that that works to very great disadvantage, and this bill provides an amendment of the law which makes it possible for the Secretary of the Interior to grant two homesteads adjoining where, in his judgment the facts warrant his doing so.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NEW. I do.

Mr. KING. Does it diminish at all the obligation resting upon the homesteader to conform to certain requirements?

Mr. NEW. Not at all.

Mr. KING. And there was a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. NEW. Yes; the committee report is entirely favorable, and it has been recommended, Mr. President, by Secretary Lane, by Secretary Houston, and by Secretary Meredith.

Mr. KING. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10806) to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved shore spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the provisions of the act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. L., p. 409), extending the homestead laws to Alaska, and of the act of March 3, 1903 (32 Stat. L., p. 1028), amendatory thereof, in so far as they reserve from sale and entry a space of at least 80 rods in width between tracts sold or entered under the provisions thereof

along the shore of any navigable water, and provide that no entry shall be allowed extending more than 160 rods along the shore of any navigable water, shall not apply to lands classified and listed by the Secretary of Agriculture for entry under the act of June 11, 1906 (34 Stat., p. 233), and that the Secretary of the Interior may upon application to enter or otherwise in his discretion restore to entry and disposition such reserved spaces and may waive the restriction that no entry shall be allowed extending more than 160 rods along the shore of any navigable water as to such lands as he shall determine are not necessary for harborage uses and purposes.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. STERLING. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on House bill 14338, relating to postal salaries.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14338) to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this matter was reported, I believe, by the Postal Salaries Commission just before we recessed, and I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the amendment which was adopted touching fourth-class postmasters. In the original report of the commission the salaries provided for fourth-class postmasters were reduced. There was an amendment adopted in the House, and that did not remedy the situation, but the fourth-class postmasters, in practically every instance, with two exceptions, I think, were reduced from the present salaries they are getting. So I offered an amendment which cured that defect and increased by a small amount the salaries of the fourth-class postmasters. I want to state to the Senate that if this report is adopted the amendment we adopted the other day will be practically knocked out and we will give the fourth-class postmaster practically no increase. No one need vote for this report thinking he is doing anything for the fourth-class postmasters in proportion to what we should do for them.

If I misstate the figures I am about to give, I want the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] to call my attention to the error, because I have compared my figures with the estimates on this proposition.

Under the present law the postmaster who gets \$25 per quarter for cancellations would get \$138 a year. Under my amendment he would get \$145. Under the commission's report, with this amendment of the conference committee, it will remain the same—\$145. If he gets \$75 for cancellations a quarter, under the amendment I have proposed, which the Senate adopted, he would get \$435 a year. Under the present plan he gets \$414. Under the plan adopted by the conference committee he gets \$435—the same.

Now we get down to \$100 cancellations. Under the present plan he gets \$460 a year. My amendment carried it to \$580. Under the amendment now proposed in this conference report it is reduced \$100 a year; in other words, to \$480. That is an increase for the postmasters who get \$100 per year for cancellations of \$20 a year, or \$5 a quarter.

If he gets \$150 cancellations a quarter, under the present plan he gets \$598 a year. Under the amendment which the Senate adopted he would get \$730 a year. Under the plan now proposed in this conference report he would get only \$610, an increase of \$12 a year for those postmasters. Three dollars a quarter is the increase provided for in this report.

Am I correct, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. STERLING. The Senator is substantially correct, so far.

Mr. HARRISON. Those are the figures, are they not?

Mr. STERLING. They are.

Mr. HARRISON. If it is \$200 a quarter cancellations, under the present law he would get \$736 a year. Under the amendment we adopted in the Senate he would get \$930 a year. Under the plan now proposed to be adopted it would be \$760 a year, or an increase from the present salaries of \$24 a year, or \$6 a quarter.

If the cancellations are \$250 a quarter, under the present plan he would get \$851 a year. Under the amendment I propose he would get \$1,110 a year. Under the plan now suggested by the conference committee he would get \$880 a year. In other words, there would be a reduction, from the plan which the Senate adopted, of \$230 a year.

If the cancellations are \$300, under the present law he would get \$966 a year. Under the plan adopted by the Senate he would get \$1,275 a year. But the conferees now have reduced it from the amount fixed by the Senate \$274 a year, providing

an increase for that class of postmasters of only \$34 a year, or around \$8.50 a quarter.

You have given under this report practically \$40,000,000 a year to the other employees of the Postal System of the country, and you have provided only the increases I have pointed out for the fourth-class postmasters.

It would seem to me that the conferees should have insisted on the action of the Senate and given to these men, who get these small salaries, the small pittance which was proposed in the amendment which was adopted, which passed the Senate practically unanimously. Yet the views of the Senate are thwarted and a conference report comes in which practically repudiates what we did.

I shall vote for the report, because I think it carries increases for men in many other instances which we should grant, but I am not voting for it under a delusion or a snare. I know what I am voting for, and I know I am not voting for a sufficient amount for the fourth-class postmasters.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is not my intention to prolong the debate on this report for more than a moment. I was not here yesterday evening when this bill was passed. I had intended at that time to submit a few observations upon it.

The bill may be, and probably is, an equitable one, but it has been attended by some features which, in my judgment, are not creditable and certainly not convincing to me of its equity. I do not believe a bill designed to secure such large sums of money from the Treasury of the United States ever had behind it such a systematic, widespread, disciplined, and thorough organization. It seemed to embrace all classes and conditions of men, in consequence of which a pressure was brought upon the activities of the Congress which appears to have been irresistible. If the equities of the bill are what are claimed for it, I am unable to perceive the necessity for resorting to such methods to secure its enactment. If it is not possessed of such equities, then the methods referred to are entirely wrong.

I regard the bill as having been passed practically with a pistol at the head of Congress. We have thereby established a precedent. Perhaps precedents were established before, but certainly we have thereby established a most significant one. The success of the movement is bound to breed its repetition time and time again in the future, whenever a large class of people have designs upon the Treasury of the United States.

I do not say, Mr. President, that the postal employees had any design upon the Treasury which was not perfectly legitimate, but I do maintain that the agreement to which I called the attention of the Senate last week, whereby the great influence of one of the first-class periodicals of the country, justly possessing the confidence of most people, was made the basis under which this propaganda was powerfully stimulated, and with a profit to the periodical to which I refer which in all probability will be measured in millions, certainly in hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to his colleague?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. I would like to inquire if my colleague thinks that the publication to which he refers had any influence whatever on the action of the commission which was working on the postal salaries bill, or on the votes of any Member of the Senate which passed the bill, or that it hastened the action of the commission in reaching its recommendations? I think not.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think it had any influence upon the commission, but I have no more doubt that it had its influence upon the Congress of the United States than I have that I am standing here. That is what it was designed for; that was its purpose; it could not have had any other.

When we consider, Mr. President, that not a telegraph message from the National Capital relating to this subject has appeared in the public prints anywhere, I am justified in the conclusion that the press of the country are particeps criminis with the Literary Digest and will receive their compensation hereafter in an organized assault against the present rates on second-class postage.

Since the publication of the advertisement in the Literary Digest I understand that the House committee has reported a bill to suspend the operation of that part of the present system of postal rates which is to take effect upon the 1st of July. Of course, nothing can be done with it, because we are about to adjourn. It is the beginning. Unless I am greatly mistaken, next winter the same forces will be active for the repealing of that statute, or at least for its nullification, whereby the rates will go back to what they were before the war.

Therefore the situation is one, Mr. President, in which, in the first instance, a large additional amount is added to our annual

expenditures; in the second place, the revenues will be decreased to the extent to which this scheme will be successful. The people ought to be acquainted with these things. They can not be informed of them if the press is in league to prevent it, and it was that aspect of the measure to which I wished to address myself last night.

Mr. President, I have said all that I care to say.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I do not desire to take issue with the criticism by the Senator from Colorado of the course of the great journal to which he referred, but I do not feel that the action of any newspaper, or a dozen newspapers, is a sufficient reason for criticizing this bill, or this plan for an increase to certain postal employees reported by our commission.

I have examined the report, not thoroughly, but far enough to satisfy myself. I am satisfied that it was carefully, honestly, and faithfully made, and made also with the view of all possible economy. That many of our postal employees have been paid less, and even under this increase will be paid less, than work of similar value requiring similar attention and intelligence receives in private employment, I have no doubt. That the increases allowed do not at all equal the increase of expenses to-day as compared to former salaries, I am satisfied.

While I have been careful to avoid voting for measures that I felt encroached upon the Treasury, I do not see how we could have done less, and I do not see how the commission could have done less than it did in its report.

I agree with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] in regretting that the amendment placed upon the bill by the Senate applicable to fourth-class postmasters was not retained in conference, but we have the bill now before us as the result of the work of the conference, and we adjourn, I can still say, to-morrow, though in a few moments I can say to-day, because the hands of the clock are just passing 12 o'clock midnight. It can not be hoped now that any additional modification can be made.

I regard the bill as thoroughly meritorious, and therefore I give the report my cordial support.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. KING. I supported the bill because I believed there was very much merit in it, but in view of the implied criticism of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] by the Senator from Georgia, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether, in his opinion, it is ethical and proper for persons who seek appropriations from Congress to carry on a propaganda, nation wide in its extent, making arrangements with newspapers by the terms of which or pursuant to which the newspapers get behind the movement?

Does the Senator think, if it be a fact, and I do not aver that it is, that the newspapers were to be the beneficiaries of this movement, and the movement was to be carried forward to the extent of trying to secure benefits with respect to second-class postal rates, that that would be ethical and proper, or does he not have words of condemnation for it?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In the first place, nothing I said was in any way in criticism of the Senator from Colorado. I opened my remarks by expressing my sympathy with the criticism that he placed upon one of the great journals that was engaged in a line of conduct which he condemned. I passed from that to the proposition that, without regard to the conduct of certain newspapers, I believed the work of our commission was a splendid piece of work, and, in my judgment, they have certainly not gone further in advancing the compensation to those to whom they gave advances than the situation absolutely required—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. One moment. I sought to discuss the question and to let it be understood that my advocacy of the measure was based upon the merits of the report of our representatives who worked out so faithfully in detail these increases.

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say that in all probability I should have voted for the measure, although I would have been much better satisfied if I could have had the time to examine fully into the report made by the commission.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to add that not simply in the interest of the men but in the interest of the service I believe our representatives have given increases that are necessary to sustain and hold up the service and retain in it the trained employees connected with it, who otherwise would go into other lines of employment in which the compensation for relative intelligence is higher.



Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word. First, with reference to certain publications and their possible influence upon the work of the commission, I think I voice the opinion of every member of the commission who had this matter under consideration for many months when I say that they were influenced in no degree whatever by what appeared in the Literary Digest, the Chicago Tribune, the New York Times, or any other great periodical in the country. But I think we may be well impressed with the idea that where there was so much comment in newspapers and periodicals throughout the country and in all sections of the country in regard to the inadequate salaries of the postal employees there was some foundation for it.

It may have been that here and there some of the statements were exaggerated, and that conditions were not so deplorable as pictured in some of the publications. I think when we consider the times as they have been, the high cost of living and the salaries these men have actually received, especially carriers in the Postal Service and postal clerks in the service, we will realize that there was need for an adjustment of those salaries and for a substantial increase in the salaries of carriers and clerks especially.

The commission has had in mind, too, in not fixing these salaries beyond where they have gone, the hope that the high cost of living will not go higher, that we have reached the crest of the wave, and that the tendency from this time on will be downward. That was of some slight consideration in fixing the increases as modestly as we did fix them.

But now, Mr. President, I wish to call attention for just a moment to the criticisms of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] in regard to the salaries of fourth-class postmasters. The Senator from Mississippi was right in the figures he gave as to the present compensation received by postmasters of this class, and right in the compensation awarded by the commission and agreed to in conference finally.

But for all post offices where the cancellations amounted to \$25 the increase proposed by the Senator from Mississippi is exactly the same as that proposed by the conferees and agreed to in conference. Where the cancellations amounted to the sum of \$50 the increase given by the commission and by the conferees is exactly the same as that proposed by the Senator from Mississippi. In all cases where the cancellations are \$75 the increase proposed by the Senator from Mississippi is exactly the same as that agreed upon in conference.

Thence on to \$1,000 or near that sum the increases agreed upon by the conferees are not so great as those proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

The contention of the conferees on the part of the House was not without some reason. I may say that now, and I would say it with even more emphasis if I entertained much doubt in my mind in regard to the adoption of the conference report, but they were unyielding in their opposition to changing the salaries of the fourth-class postmasters.

Why do I say that their opposition was not without some reason? I say it because it would involve a cost of at least \$6,000,000 to carry out the increases provided for in the amendment offered the other evening by the Senator from Mississippi and adopted here without any discussion in the Senate. We are receiving now \$23,000,000 under the present compensation rates from post offices of the fourth class. We disburse a little more than \$20,000,000, leaving about \$3,000,000 surplus. Under the increases proposed by the Senator from Mississippi the \$3,000,000 surplus would be entirely wiped out and it would cost the Government of the United States \$3,000,000 on top of that.

How would it cost that? It would arise first directly because of the increase, but as great an increase in cost to the Government, if not a greater one, would arise indirectly from the fact that under the basis proposed by the Senator from Mississippi the men in the fourth-class post offices would be advanced with great rapidity into the post offices of the third class, with the additional expenses of the third-class post offices, such as clerk hire, such as rent, such as fuel, light, and so forth. This would make the great increase of at least \$6,000,000.

Why, Mr. President, under the proposition of the Senator from Mississippi we would not increase those whose cancellations do not exceed \$75 per quarter, and that involves 20,360 fourth-class postmasters, nearly one-half of the whole number of fourth-class postmasters. Take the cancellations ranging from \$75 to \$100 a quarter on which we gave an increase to 120 per cent, instead of 115 per cent, and there are 3,669 postmasters who are affected, leaving a remainder of 18,043 postmasters receiving still more.

This is the way in which the additional cost to the Government is made up. Although under some schedules which were

proposed some of the fourth-class postmasters would receive less than they are receiving now with bonuses which are given them, yet under the plan agreed to in conference there is not a fourth-class postmaster but receives some increase, although in instances it might be a slight one, amounting to a few dollars only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, some time ago the House passed a river and harbor bill providing for \$12,000,000. It came over to the Senate and the Commerce Committee put various amendments upon it and recommended that the amount of \$12,000,000 be increased to \$20,000,000. On the floor of the Senate this amount was raised to \$24,000,000 and the bill was sent to conference.

We held a conference with the conferees on the part of the House and reached an agreement on all the amendments that were made, except upon amendment No. 1. This amendment is the amendment providing for the amount to be carried in the bill.

We had a further conference with reference to that and have been unable to reach an agreement. The Senate conferees proposed to the House conferees at the first conference, after considerable discussion and after considering the facts which were brought out, to agree to \$18,000,000; but the House refused. We brought the report to the Senate, the report was accepted, and the bill was sent back to conference.

We had another meeting, and after further consideration and discussion, and noting the attitude of the House, the Senate conferees proposed to accept \$15,000,000.

Mr. KING. Was that refusal on the part of the Senate or the House conferees?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The proposal was made by the Senate members of the conference committee; but the House refused to accept that amount. We separated and we have since had no meeting. We have asked the House conferees for a meeting in order that we might report a disagreement, so that if the report went to the House first that body could act upon it and give their conferees such direction as they might deem wise. The House members of the conference committee advised us when they asked for the second conference that the House was inclined to instruct them to insist upon the House provision, but they did not do so. Our request that we should meet and report a disagreement, so that either House might have an opportunity to pass upon the matter, was refused. It seems that the House conferees are determined that there shall be no river and harbor bill or that it shall carry no greater amount than \$12,000,000.

The Senate conferees, in view of the action of the Senate, did not feel justified in assuming the responsibility of receding from the Senate amendment. I have therefore decided to bring the matter before the Senate and let the Senate take such action as it sees fit. So, Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; I will yield the floor to the Senator from Missouri if he desires to discuss the matter.

Mr. SPENCER. I only wish to say a word or two.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have sent for the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I think he desires to discuss it.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, this matter is, of course, of vital interest to the Mississippi Valley, and I should much dislike to see anything interfere with the proper development of the waterways of that section. There is no reason why the Senate should not insist upon an amendment that is supported by reason, but here are the facts in this case:

The House arbitrarily fixed the amount of the appropriation at \$12,000,000; they fixed that sum notwithstanding the department which had the matter in charge had reported that \$24,000,000 was the least that they could get along with.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact, however, that there is a considerable undisbursed balance which is available for the current year, and that that prompted the House to take the position which it did?

Furthermore, the House took into account the financial obligations resting upon the Government, and, in that spirit of



economy which I commend to the Senate, determined to reduce the appropriation to the lowest possible amount.

Mr. SPENCER. Of that spirit I cordially approve, and I am taking into account the amount of the available balance. I can give an illustration in a moment which I think will explain the matter.

Fully considering the available unexpended balance, the Engineer Department, having charge of waterway improvements, insisted that \$24,000,000 was the least that they could get along with. When the committee considered the matter—and I am not on the committee—they finally made up their minds, as I recollect, to report \$18,000,000. The Senator from Washington will correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Our committee reported \$20,000,000.

Mr. SPENCER. The committee reported \$20,000,000 as being the minimum amount that could possibly provide for river and harbor work next year.

Mr. REED. The amount was \$24,000,000.

Mr. SPENCER. The committee reported \$20,000,000. When the bill reached the Senate there was an effort to secure \$27,000,000, but the Senate finally determined that \$24,000,000, which was the minimum estimate of the department, was the least that ought to be appropriated for the development of the inland waterways of the country.

The matter went to the conference. Of course, I have a certain amount of pride in the judgment of the Senate, all the more so when it is based upon the actual estimate of the department; but when the bill went to conference the House replied, "We stand on \$12,000,000." Such a position is indefensible in reason; it has no estimate to support it; it is a mere arbitrary statement ostensibly based on the ground of economy. I am free to say for myself that I would rather say to the House, "Let the whole inland waterways bill fail," than have the Senate recede from its amendment, which has every reason back of it, merely to meet a position of the House which is not founded upon reason. I hope the Senate will refuse to recede; and if that refusal to recede defeats the whole bill, let it be defeated, because the Senate is right in the matter.

One word more and I am through. This is the situation as to the unexpended balance: Between Cairo and St. Louis there is available for the next year \$262,000. There is a fair channel between the Gulf and the Ohio at Cairo, perhaps a 9-foot channel. Its usefulness is greatly limited unless it is continued to St. Louis; the thousand and more miles upon which the steamers can travel up to the Ohio River avail little if the 120 miles between the Ohio and St. Louis or the Missouri are not navigable. The estimates show that for that short distance to provide even an 8-foot channel in the next year will require from \$500,000 to \$800,000. We might as well have no bill as to let an unexpended balance of \$262,000, which will not accomplish the purpose, be the only amount that we have available. I would as soon have nothing as that.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Commerce, and as one who urged a larger appropriation than that authorized by the House, I regret very much the attitude of the House conferees. I stated in the Committee on Commerce and before the Senate that river and harbor work would cost this year more than double what it cost two or three years ago; that labor would cost two or three times more as well as material; and that \$24,000,000, or at least \$20,000,000, which was the amount the Committee on Commerce reported, ought to have been authorized. However, I have made some inquiries about the situation in the House in the last two or three days, and I know there is a group of men in the House, particularly those who are in control of the River and Harbor Committee, who have determined that unless we agree to the \$12,000,000 appropriation they will let the bill fail; in fact, I know that some members of the committee would prefer to have the bill fail.

I am not willing to have that done; I would rather have \$12,000,000 than to have nothing. I say this, Mr. President, not because of any interest my city or my State may have, for of the unexpended balance there is more to the credit of the improvements in and about the harbor of New York, the Hudson River and the East River than there is to the credit of any other great improvement in the country. The money appropriated by the bill is needed more in other sections of the country than it is in New York; but I think that, in the interest of river and harbor improvements of the country generally, the bill should not fail, and therefore I trust that when the Senate comes to vote on the matter it will determine to accept \$12,000,000 rather than to let the bill fail.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate takes a recess to-day it be until 11 o'clock this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we have reached a stage in our proceedings when the disposition of the Senate is to do almost anything to get its business through in any kind of shape. For that sentiment I have no criticism. I do not rise to make any perfunctory remarks, but rather to insist that the interest of the country demands that the Senate shall adhere to its amendment to the river and harbor bill. If I can claim the attention of the Senators who are present for a few moments, I should like to submit my reasons for the position which I take.

The work of river and harbor improvement, broadly speaking, is of two characters. In some places it consists in the removal from harbors of permanent obstructions, such as great rocks and reefs, which constitute an embargo upon the free movements of vessels. That character of work may be prosecuted by piecemeal, because in so far as it is prosecuted it is permanent. This much, however, is to be said, that if the appropriation fails and the work lags the expense of moving equipment and of disorganizing the working forces, and all that is incidental to the breaking up of work already established, is exceedingly expensive. Nevertheless, the work is permanent in its character, and what is done is not absolutely lost; but in the improvement of rivers, to a very large extent it may be said that if work is only partially done, if it is not prosecuted to its completion, it is subject to destruction, to entire loss. A revetment along the bank of a stream which needs to be completed, if left in its uncompleted state, is liable to be entirely destroyed by the next flood, but if completed it will remain there for many years.

We have been for years pursuing upon the rivers of this country a policy of piecemeal construction. That was bad enough, because, pursued in that way, much of the work was destroyed from year to year which could have been made permanent by the expenditure of a reasonable additional amount, and thus the money could have realized its value. Even that policy, however, is now to be abandoned. The amount appropriated by the House of Representatives is not sufficient even to maintain the improvements that are in place in their present condition. The appropriation of \$12,000,000 is practically the waste of \$12,000,000, or, at least, the waste of a very large part of it.

We are in the situation that a man is in with a house without a roof upon it, and we propose to appropriate just about enough money to half maintain the walls, and in the meantime the elements are destroying the entire structure. We either ought to appropriate enough money to bring these improvements to a condition where their value can be realized and where their permanency can be insured, or we ought to stop appropriating altogether.

The House of Representatives has taken a position upon this proposition that is absolutely indefensible. As was well stated by my colleague [Mr. SPENCER], there is no estimate by any officer of the Government warranting an appropriation of \$12,000,000. It is an arbitrary figure, fixed by some gentlemen who have established, in their own minds, an arbitrary standard which they propose to follow. The arbitrary figure was fixed by a political steering committee which has more regard for a political argument in the coming campaign than it has for the welfare of this country. A lot of gentlemen got their heads together and said, in substance and effect, "We must show the American people that a Republican Congress has saved them money"; and they picked out the river and harbor bill as the example of economy, and they have thought in their fatuous manner that they could go before the American people and say, "Previous Congresses appropriated thirty or forty millions of dollars, and, behold, we have saved you the difference between that amount and \$12,000,000."

This is rather plain talk, but it is true talk; and at the same time that they have been cutting down the river and harbor appropriations they have been voting for bills that would take out of the Public Treasury, if they become laws, hundreds of millions of dollars. The House of Representatives did not find any difficulty in passing a bill a few days ago or a few hours ago, for purely political reasons, which would cost the American people in the long run hundreds of millions of dollars. They thought there were votes back of that measure, and day after day has witnessed the passage of measures that have disregarded every principle of economy. The one subject that is picked out as an example of economy and reform is the rivers and harbors of this country.

These gentlemen may think they are going to fool the American people, but the American people have never yet been deceived by so cheap a device and so transparent a subterfuge. The American people have practical sense enough to know the difference between an expenditure which is an outlay of money, pure and simple, and which brings nothing back to the Government or the people, and an expenditure of money which will



bring back a hundred or a thousand fold. The American people will appreciate the fact that for cheap political claptrap the internal improvements of this country have been sacrificed.

We are talking about sending money to Europe by the millions and expending it over there to build roads and rehabilitate foreign lands and at the same moment we propose to arrest a great system of internal improvements in our own land which has been all too much retarded in the past. Instead of this Congress sitting down to see how little money they can expend in improving the highways of this land and indulging in the cheap play of politics and in cheeseparing operations, we ought to be inaugurating at this period of our national development the greatest scheme of internal development ever conceived.

The highways that nature has builded for us ought to be harnessed and employed. The swamp lands that are richer than the Valley of the Nile ought to be reclaimed and given to agriculture and production. The arid lands of the West ought to be watered and transformed into gardens. The money of the people ought to be expended to make this the richest and most prosperous country in the world, and to multiply the advantages we already have achieved. I say that if this policy of improvement, all too poorly pursued in the past, is to be abandoned, let us abandon it all, and let the House of Representatives take the responsibility of killing the entire bill. Better no bill at all than this sort of legislative fraud that is being perpetrated.

[At this point a message was received from the House of Representatives announcing that the House had agreed to the conference report on H. R. 10378, the merchant marine bill.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that bill has finally been passed, and I say that a million dollars was taken from the American people by its passage. I understand it was passed by a party vote in the House, and I am glad the Democrats are beginning to wake up. I do not know that my information is strictly accurate, but that is the information I have. Every man in this body who voted to exempt the ship companies from taxation, while they impose taxes upon the wage earner, will be apologizing for it.

I do not intend to waste my energies talking here very much longer. I say to reject this report and send it back for further conference. Let us see whether the House of Representatives will defeat the entire bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the Senator must have a misunderstanding. We are not submitting any report. The conferees on the part of the House, as I stated a while ago, have refused to confer even to report a disagreement, and I have simply brought the question before the Senate as to whether or not the Senate will recede from its amendments.

Mr. REED. Very well. I thank the Senator. I say to send back word to the House that the Senate proposes to stand by its action. I have been in this body now nearly 10 years, a good deal longer than any man ought to be required to undergo what we undergo here, and I have seen the Senate bulldozed by the House of Representatives until I am tired of it. I have never seen the House of Representatives shut its jaws yet but what the Senate lay down, never once. I admire the House for their courage and tenacity, but it is time that this Chamber manifested a little spirit itself.

Mr. President, I hope the word will go back to the House of Representatives that the Senate proposes to stand by its action, that we shall take that position and maintain it, and if we have no river and harbor bill, let the House of Representatives take the responsibility, for a river and harbor bill which carries only \$12,000,000 is just the same as no river and harbor bill; it is worse than that, indeed, because a large part of the \$12,000,000 will be wasted for the reasons I gave in the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. President, that is my view of it and I am one of those who are interested in the river and harbor bill.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 13742. An act to amend sections 3 and 6 of the act of July 11, 1916, entitled "An act to provide that the United States

shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," as amended by sections 5 and 6 of the act of February 28, 1919, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes"; and

H. J. Res. 270. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a monument marking the starting point of the motor convoy from Washington to San Francisco.

#### MOTOR CONVOY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if I can get unanimous consent I would like to have the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the joint resolution which has just been received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate House joint resolution 270. The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 270) authorizing the erection of a monument marking the starting point of the motor convoy from Washington to San Francisco was read twice by its title.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, that convoy is going over what is known as the Bankhead Highway, a highway named after my late colleague. Some of his friends want to have the privilege of placing a marker there as a monument to him. I do not think it is necessary for me to say more. It will cost the Government nothing. It merely gives the authority. If there is no objection, I would like to have it passed now.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to permit the replacement of the temporary monument located on the United States meridian of longitude at a point on the north side of the Ellipse, within the District of Columbia, by a permanent monument, which shall mark the starting point of the motor convoy from Washington, D. C., to San Francisco, Calif., and which may serve as a point from which distances may be measured on United States highways radiating from Washington, D. C. Such replacement shall be made without expense to the United States, and the design of such monument shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 13742. An act to amend sections 3 and 6 of the act of July 11, 1916, entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," as amended by sections 5 and 6 of the act of February 28, 1919, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, there is a good deal of force in what has just been said so eloquently by the two Senators from Missouri.

I can not agree, however, with the conclusions of the two gentlemen in desiring to have this bill fail because we can not get the House to agree with the wishes of the Senate in this matter. I am a member of the Commerce Committee, and I was quite active in helping to prepare this bill.

The bill as reported from the committee carried \$20,000,000, which was less than I thought it should carry by a pretty considerable sum. I was glad when the Senate raised the amount to \$24,000,000. But, Mr. President and Senators, I have tried to be practical in this body and elsewhere.

The conferees representing the Senate, after considerable effort, finally offered the House conferees to take \$15,000,000. Fifteen million dollars is only \$3,000,000 more than the House passed. The \$15,000,000 which we agreed to was a reduction of 75 per cent in the increase which we had made in the bill, and I submit, Mr. President and Senators, I assure you we went into it carefully, conferring again with the engineers of the Army, after having conferred with them very carefully before reporting the bill to the Senate, and if, after the most mature study, we stand ready to compromise on a basis of \$15,000,000, there is not going to be very great harm done if we now compromise further and take \$12,000,000. That is a general proposition.

I wish to call the attention of the Senators to the fact that this bill carries a great deal besides the mere appropriation of \$12,000,000. It provides for 113 surveys. Many Senators, in discussing the bill, have overlooked that fact entirely. There are a number of most important changes in the various waterway projects of this country, and surveys on 113 of them are ordered in this bill.

All the Senators know that the engineers can not carry on any work of importance on any river or on any harbor unless

the project has first been surveyed under an order made by the Congress in a river and harbor bill. That is the initial step. In this bill we have ordered 113 such surveys. That is quite important as a preliminary step to the very liberal bill which many of us hope will be enacted next December.

There are also other very important provisions in this bill, one of which authorizes sums given for maintenance of projects to be used by the engineers in the prosecution of those projects, and vice versa. It has been customary to make a certain appropriation to maintain a project, and a certain appropriation to prosecute work on the project.

It is very advantageous to authorize the Engineer Corps to spend those sums. There is a provision of that kind in this bill. It has never been passed heretofore in any river and harbor bill. The engineers regard it as quite important, and I am sure it is a very important provision.

There are also special and quite important provisions in regard to the Yakima Bay, Oreg.; to the harbor at Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Delaware River between the city of Philadelphia and the city of Trenton; to St. Johns River, Fla.; to the Cumberland River above Nashville, Tenn.; to Willapa Harbor and River in the State of Washington; to the Houston ship channel; and to the Savannah River; special items authorizing measures of more or less importance to all those projects I have named, and in some instances the provisions are very important indeed to those localities.

Then there is an item repealing a provision passed in the act of last year which said that unless the work could be done on a river and harbor project at not more than 40 per cent over and above the estimated cost of that work when the original survey was made on which Congress ordered the work to be done, it could not be undertaken. All of us know that public works and private works of every kind have increased a great deal more than 40 per cent. Any of us who has attempted to build a house or to do improvement of any kind in the last 12 months knows that it can not be done for anything like 40 per cent over and above the estimated cost of that project two or three or four years ago. So the imposition of that provision practically nullifies our authority to do the work on quite a number of projects. This bill proposes to repeal that provision. It is too onerous. It ties the hands of the Engineer Corps. The House made no objection to that.

Another important provision, one quite important to a number of poor people, is that which authorizes the engineers, in case of damage done by collision between any of the boats or barges belonging to the Engineer Corps and some private interests, to settle the claims for damages without resort to Congress or the courts, provided those claims do not exceed \$500 in amount. You can readily see that in a big country like this, with so many transactions carried on as come up under the work of the Engineer Corps, there are a great many cases where the damages amount to less than \$500, and it would be a very great hardship not to have these matters settled promptly by the Engineer Corps of the Army, just as for years the Navy Department has been authorized to settle similar claims.

There are other provisions here which I will not attempt to take the time of the Senate to explain. I simply wish to repeat what I have already said, that while I am greatly disappointed that we can not get what we feel we should have, I believe we should recede and accept the \$12,000,000 which the House is willing to give us. I think it is far better than not to have any river and harbor bill, and I earnestly hope that we will vote to recede from our disagreement and let this bill pass.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 1 to the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

#### MONONGAHELA RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, there is a bill which came over from the House a little while ago for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, Pa. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox] is very anxious to have the bill passed, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 13962) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the borough of Wilson, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge, authorized by act of Congress approved February 27, 1919, to be built across the Monongahela River, at or near

the borough of Wilson, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, are hereby extended two and four years, respectively, from the date of approval herof.

That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AIDS TO NAVIGATION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to report from the Committee on Commerce the bill (H. R. 10183) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. Before my request is submitted I desire to make just a brief statement, because I know that the first impression of the bill will be unfavorable:

This is a bill to authorize aids to navigation in connection with light ships, lighthouse tenders, and things like that, for the protection of life at sea and along our coast. It has passed the House and was ordered favorably reported by the Commerce Committee of the Senate a few days ago. The bill makes no appropriation whatever. It simply authorizes work within certain limits as appropriations may hereafter be made, and the necessity for it is based, as we are informed—

Mr. KING. If the Senator does not make any observations, I think there will be no objection on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well; but I am not talking for the purpose of being heard.

Mr. KING. Let us consider the bill. I have looked into it and it seems to be a very meritorious measure.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It merely establishes a program so that they can send estimates to Congress and they can be considered and appropriations be made if they are found necessary.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 10183) to authorize aids to navigation and for other work in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to establish, provide, or improve the following aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, under the Department of Commerce, in accordance with the respective limits of cost hereinafter respectively set forth, which shall in no case be exceeded:

Constructing or purchasing and equipping lighthouse tenders and light vessels for the Lighthouse Service, \$5,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Shipping Board shall report to the Secretary of Commerce such vessels as they are willing to dispose of, and which by reasonable alterations can be used for light vessels, or lighthouse tenders; and if the use of the vessels should be justified by the necessary expenditure for alterations, transfer of the ships shall be made to the Department of Commerce, and they shall be used for the purposes of this act; and the sum herein authorized shall be available for such repairs and be reduced by the sums saved by the use of such vessels.

#### THIRD LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Extending and enlarging the machine shop at the general lighthouse depot, Tompkinsville, Staten Island, N. Y., \$15,000 additional to the amount appropriated in act of July 19, 1919.

Riprap to reinforce foundations and protect them from damage by sea and ice and make more accessible boat landings at certain light stations, \$134,000.

#### FOURTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Improving the aids to navigation at the entrance to Delaware Bay, \$148,500.

#### SIXTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Completing the lighthouse depot for the sixth lighthouse district at Charleston, S. C., \$60,000.

#### SEVENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Establishing and improving aids to navigation in Tampa Bay, Fla., \$17,500.

Purchasing site and constructing and equipping a lighthouse depot for the seventh lighthouse district, \$250,000.

#### EIGHTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Improving Galveston Jetty Light Station, Tex., including fog-signal station, \$6,500.

#### TWELFTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Improving aids to navigation and establishing new aids at Ludington, Mich., \$50,000.

#### SIXTEENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

For improvements to aids to navigation in Alaska, including improving of Point Retreat and Cape Hinchinbrook Light Station, \$32,500.

Continuing construction of the lighthouse depot for the sixteenth lighthouse district, \$12,000.

#### EIGHTEENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Establishing aids to navigation, California, \$25,000.

Constructing two keepers' dwellings at the Goat Island Lighthouse Depot, Calif., \$16,500.

#### NINETEENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Constructing and equipping a lighthouse depot at Honolulu, Hawaii, \$120,000, in lieu of \$90,000 authorized in act of August 28, 1916.

SEC. 2. That hereafter the salary of the Superintendent of Naval Construction in the Bureau of Lighthouses shall be \$4,000 per annum.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.



MICHAEL M'GARVEY.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, there is on the calendar a bill (H. R. 6407) for the relief of Michael MacGarvey, who was injured while in the employ of the Government at Governors Island, N. Y. The bill appropriates only \$35 for injury received by him, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$35 to Michael MacGarvey, police laborer in the employ of the depot quartermaster, Governors Island, N. Y., for damage caused to a set of false teeth incident to said service.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think if we are going to take up bills from the calendar we ought to run through the calendar under Rule VIII and take up the bills to which there is no objection. I am going to ask at this time unanimous consent that we proceed to the consideration of the calendar under Rule VIII, and consider only bills to which there is no objection—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator withhold that request for a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. And that the calendar be laid aside as soon as any supply bill comes in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

## LEATHER STATISTICS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. From the Committee on the Census I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 10011) authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish monthly statistics concerning hides, skins, and leather, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia requests unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the Senator from West Virginia if those statistics are not now collected?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will say to the Senator that it has been attempted to be done by the Department of Agriculture through the Bureau of Markets, but it has been very imperfectly done and it is not of real value. It will give a much more complete view of the situation with reference to hides and leather, and tend to steady the market. All those who are interested in the subject, the tanners and the leather people, think this a very much better way to get at it.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill be read and let us see just what it is, because I do not want a duplication of the work.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is not contemplated that there will be a duplication at all. This will take the place of the other work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah request the reading of the entire bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Director of the Census be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to collect and publish statistics monthly concerning—

(a) The quantities and classes of hides and skins, owned or stored, and the quantities and classes of such products disposed of during the preceding census month by packers, abattoirs, butchers, tanners, jobbers, dealers, wholesalers, importers, and exporters;

(b) The quantities and classes of hides and skins in the process of tanning or manufacture, the quantities and amount of finished product for the preceding month;

(c) The quantities and classes of leather owned or stored and manufactured during the preceding census month by tanners, jobbers, dealers, wholesalers, importers, exporters, and establishments cutting or consuming leather.

SEC. 2. That the information furnished by any individual establishment under the provisions of this act shall be considered as strictly confidential and shall be used only for the statistical purposes for which it is supplied. Any employee of the Bureau of Census who, without the written authority of the Director of the Census, shall publish or communicate any information given into his possession by reason of his employment under the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of every owner, president, or treasurer, secretary, director, or other officer or agent of any abattoir and of any packing, tanning, jobbing, dealing, wholesaling, importing, or exporting establishment where hides and skins are stored or sold, or leather is tanned, treated, finished, or stored or any establishment is engaged in the cutting of leather or in the production of boots and shoes, gloves, saddlery, harness, or other manufactures of leather goods, wherever leather is consumed, when requested by the Director of the

Census or by any special agent or other employee of the Census Office acting under the instructions of said director to furnish completely and accurately to the best of his knowledge, all the information authorized to be collected by section 1 of this act. The demand of the Director of the Census for such information shall be made in writing or by a visiting representative and if made in writing shall be forwarded by registered mail and the registry receipt of the Post Office Department shall be accepted as prima facie evidence of such demand. Any owner, president, treasurer, secretary, director, or other officer or agent of any establishment required to furnish information under the provisions of this act, who under the conditions hereinbefore stated shall refuse or willfully neglect to furnish any of the information herein provided for or shall willfully give answers that are false, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than \$1,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the Senator from West Virginia about the appropriation that has been made in the Agricultural appropriation bill for this very purpose. Is that repealed, or will they go right on and spend that money and then spend this amount under the Director of the Census?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The understanding is that the Department of Agriculture will cease the attempt to get these statistics, and that it will not require any additional appropriation for the Census Bureau. It will be done with the same force. The bill does not carry any appropriation and does not require any on the part of the Census Office. This will obviate the necessity of the Bureau of Markets collecting these statistics.

Mr. SMOOT. Is there anything in the bill which specifically denies that power to or takes it from the Bureau of Markets, because if there is not they will go right on and do that work and spend the money.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I understand they will stop collecting these statistics if this bill is passed. The Director of the Census is to require no appropriation on his part at all to collect the statistics. I will say to the Senator that under the present law there are no penalties and the figures supplied to the bureau have not been at all complete. They have been very misleading. There is a penalty provided in this bill, and the work is done under authority of law in a much more strict and more valuable way.

Mr. SMOOT. I know the information will be very beneficial, and if it is not already being done by some department of the Government, perhaps it will be a good thing to have the information collected in this way.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it would be very much better.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to see some amendment placed on the bill repealing that part of the Agricultural appropriation act that authorized the expenditure of money for this purpose, but I do not know that it can be done this morning. I shall not object to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Chair put my request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear the Senator's request.

Mr. SMOOT. My request was that we take up the calendar under Rule VIII.

Mr. HARRIS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Utah that the present occupant of the chair was advised by the previous occupant of the chair that he had agreed to recognize the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] to make a motion, but the Senator from Georgia did not address the Chair and so the Chair had to recognize the Senator from Utah. However, the Chair feels that the Senator from Georgia ought to have a chance to make the motion which he desires to make.

Mr. SMOOT. I will not claim the right to the floor, and will yield when the Senator makes his motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Georgia yield for a moment for the Senator from South Dakota to submit a report from a committee of which the Senator from Georgia is a member?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield, provided it does not take me from the floor.

Mr. KING. I think it would take no time at all.

Mr. HARRIS. I yield, provided it does not take me from the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent that he may hold the floor while the Senator from South Dakota makes a report. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

## EXCLUSION OF UNDESIRABLE ALIENS.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, from the Committee on Immigration I report back favorably with amendments House bill 11224, and ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report and bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, do I understand this does not take the Senator from Georgia from the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the Senator from Georgia has the floor to see if this measure can be acted upon, and yields for that purpose. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11224) to amend the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes," approved October 16, 1918.

The amendments were, on page 1, in line 10, after the word "who," to strike out the word "entertain"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "that," to strike out the word "entertain"; on page 2, line 2, to strike out the words "disbelief in or"; in lines 15 and 16, to strike out "(d) aliens who write, circulate, distribute, print, publish, edit, issue, or display," and insert in lieu thereof "(d) aliens who write, publish, or cause to be written or published, or who knowingly circulate, distribute, print, or display"; in line 18, after the word "or," to insert the word "knowingly"; in line 19, after the word "be," to strike out the word "written"; and, in line 19, after the word "published," to strike out the words "edited, issued"; in line 20, after the word "who," to insert the word "knowingly"; in line 22, to strike out the first word in the line, "issue," and the last word in the line, "expressing"; in line 23, after the word "taking," to strike out the words "disbelief in or"; in line 24, after the word "or," to strike out the words "expressing a belief in"; on page 3, line 11, after the word "publishers," to strike out the words "edits, issues"; in line 13, after the word "published," to strike out the words "edited, issued," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes," approved October 16, 1918, is amended to read as follows:

"That the following aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States:

"(a) Aliens who are anarchists;  
"(b) Aliens who advise, advocate, or teach, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group, that advises, advocates, or teaches opposition to all organized government;

"(c) Aliens who believe in, advise, advocate, or teach, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group, that believes in, advises, advocates, or teaches: (1) the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law, or (2) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character, or (3) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property, or (4) sabotage;

"(d) Aliens who write, publish, or cause to be written or published, or who knowingly circulate, distribute, print, or display, or knowingly cause to be circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or who knowingly have in their possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, or display, any written or printed matter, advising, advocating, or teaching opposition to all organized government, or advising, advocating, or teaching: (1) the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law, or (2) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, or (3) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property, or (4) sabotage;

"(e) Aliens who are members of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group, that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, or displays, or causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue, or display, any written or printed matter of the character described in subdivision (d).

"For the purpose of this section: (1) the giving, loaning, or promising of money or any thing of value to be used for the advising, advocacy, or teaching of any doctrine above enumerated shall constitute the advising, advocacy, or teaching of such doctrine; and (2) the giving, loaning, or promising of money or any thing of value to any organization, association, society, or group of the character above described shall constitute affiliation therewith; but nothing in this paragraph shall be taken as an exclusive definition of advising, advocacy, teaching, or affiliation."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

## MILITARY JUSTICE.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent to strike from the calendar Order of Business 478, being Senate bill 64, to estab-

lish military justice, because it has been included in other legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? No objection being heard, it is so ordered.

## INCOME AND PROFITS TAX RETURNS.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I call up my motion to discharge the Finance Committee from the further consideration of Senate joint resolution 146, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the Senate certain detailed information secured from income and profits tax returns of the taxable year 1918, the yeas and nays on which motion have already been ordered.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator—I was not in the Chamber when the resolution was read—to state what is its scope. I ask for information.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the resolution has been brought up a dozen times in the Senate, and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] several times objected to unanimous consent for its consideration. He then asked that it be referred to the Committee on Finance, with the distinct understanding, after the yeas and nays had been ordered, that we should get a vote on it the next day. The Record will show that to be true. That was two weeks ago, and I have since been waiting for the Finance Committee to make some report. They have not done so; and I am now asking for the yeas and nays on my motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to explain to the Senate exactly the situation as it is, so that the Senate may decide whether or not it is a good thing to agree to the motion to discharge the committee.

It is true, as the Senator from Georgia has stated, that the resolution was called up in the Senate and the yeas and nays were ordered. It is also true that I stated upon the floor of the Senate that a meeting of the Finance Committee would be called the following morning for the consideration of the joint resolution; and, so far as I was concerned, I was perfectly willing to report the resolution out that very day. That meeting was called for the next morning.

At the first meeting the question as to how soon the work could be done and how much it would cost came up. It was decided to ask the officials of the Treasury Department to come to a meeting in the afternoon at 2 or 3 o'clock, I forget which. At that meeting the Senator from Georgia was requested to be present. We had the officials from the Treasury Department before the committee and we took up the resolution of the Senator from Georgia and asked the officials to give the committee information as to just how much it would cost to make the investigation and how soon the work could be accomplished.

It developed, Mr. President, that the desired information covering the one year concerning the 35,000 corporations mentioned in Document No. 259 would cost \$600,000, and that the work could not be accomplished within a period of less than six months; that if the scope of the resolution were extended to the year 1919 as well as to the year 1918, it would then cost \$1,200,000 and require approximately nine months to perform the work.

The officials of the Treasury Department also notified the committee that it would greatly interfere with the work of the department, as it was impossible to get the class of expert accountants necessary to undertake the task without interfering with work they were then doing in the investigation of corporation-tax returns in the effort upon the part of the department to settle finally the question as to whether there are to be upon those returns more taxes paid than had been reported by the corporations themselves.

There are 365,000 corporations in the United States. In Document No. 259 the officials selected 32,000 corporations; and if only those 32,000 corporations are investigated, then, as I have said, it will cost \$600,000, and it will be at least six months before the information can be obtained.

Mr. President, I thought—and the Senator from Georgia, I am quite sure, will bear me out—that in connection with this information there ought to be shown whether or not there was an increase in the returns in 1918 over the returns of 1917 as reported in Document No. 259. Of course, that would require a little more expenditure and a little more time.

I sent to the Finance Committee room a few moments ago to secure the written report which the committee requested the officials of the Treasury Department to submit, stating in detail just what it would require to make the investigation. I have not been able as yet to obtain the report.

I want to be perfectly frank with the Senator from Georgia, and I will say that the committee did not feel justified in inter-



fering with the most important work in connection with these returns which the Treasury Department is carrying on, when the information could not be obtained until six months from now and would cost, at the very least, \$600,000, and if the two years were covered it would cost \$1,200,000.

That is the situation exactly as reported to us from the Treasury Department, and the Finance Committee thought that under those conditions it would be a very unwise thing to have the resolution passed at this time.

If it is going to require six months to perform the work, we might as well let it go until there can be completed the work which is crowding the department at this particular time in connection with the returns of corporations, from which the Government hopes to collect, perhaps, tens and hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes, because of the failure of the corporations to report all their profits or because they reported them in such a way that their statements do not conform to the law in every particular.

I do not want to say that the Senate should not act upon this matter, but I do want the Senate to know what it will mean and what it will cost, and then they can judge whether the joint resolution should be passed. I wish to say now, however, that there is not an official in the Treasury Department who did not plead with the committee not to take their experts away from their present duties to do the work which would be necessary under the joint resolution, which can not possibly do any good for six or eight months and which would interfere with the most important work that is being carried on in that department to-day. That is the situation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Utah is very amusing to me after having listened to the Treasury officials and after what the Senator has stated so many times about the departments having more clerks than they needed. The joint resolution does not require the information at a certain time. The Treasury Department will not employ one single extra clerk, and they can take their own time for this work. Of course, the Treasury Department clerks prefer not to do the extra work. The Senator did not tell all that the Treasury Department officials stated the other day, and I should like to have the Senator tell the Senate what they said about what could be done if \$200,000 was spent.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I would be glad if the Senator would state that himself. I do not want to state it until I get the report and read the exact words of the Treasury officials. If the Senator has a copy of the report before him, I should like to have him read it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Senator says the Treasury Department officials would take nine months on this work. Here [exhibiting] is the report of the department in the other case where the Senate asked for such a report, and it took 27 days to perform the work.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator must not make that statement. The Senator knows that the officials of the department stated that that report was made up, practically; that it was almost complete; that when the resolution of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] was passed the report was practically all prepared; and all they had to do was to get it into shape for printing and send it to the Printing Office, where it was printed. That is what the Treasury officials said. They stated, however, that if the resolution of the Senator from Georgia was passed, information as to every corporation included in Document No. 259 would be obtained after a complete examination of every one of them, and that it would be impossible to make that investigation for the year 1918 alone in less than six months.

Mr. President, I know the Senator from Georgia wants to be perfectly fair, and I think he will agree with me that the Treasury Department officials also stated that the figures in Document No. 259 related to returns under the law of 1916, which was a very simple law indeed, whereas the joint resolution of the Senator asks for the figures under the complicated law of 1918, and it is impossible, they say, to get them out. I will ask the Senator if that is not so?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I do not remember the exact statement made by the officials of the Treasury Department.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], if the statement which I have made is not as it was reported?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I regret that we have not the testimony before us. I think it is now printed, but we could not get it printed before yesterday or to-day, and I had supposed, as the Senator from Georgia has been absent for some time, there would be no desire to press the joint resolution under the circumstances and in view of the testimony that was taken.

The information, as suggested by the Senator from Utah, was to the effect that the report that was made under the prior law

would be of no assistance to them whatever in making out a report as to the returns under the new law, which would cover a more complicated and extensive field. We thought, after considering the length of time the investigation would take, involving at least nine months' delay, and its cost, amounting to from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000, that it would hardly pay us. If the Senator will examine, as he no doubt has examined, the report that was made upon the returns under the simple law of 1916, I think he will find that we have made very little use of that report.

The document is so bulky—there is so much of it—that Senators do not even look at it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, there is nothing of more interest to the people of this country than to find out who the profiteers are and what they are making. This information will show just what the profiteers are doing. I admit that it will cost some money, but I think it will be worth a great deal more than it costs.

The other day the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] made a speech two hours long, and most of the information used was gotten from the report that I have before me, for which the Senate asked the Treasury Department two years ago.

I shall ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the RECORD of the 21st of May shows that the Senator from Georgia moved to discharge the Committee on Finance from the consideration of the matter referred to. The yeas and nays were ordered upon the motion. There was debate, and finally the Senator from Georgia, the mover of the motion, said:

I will let the matter go over until to-morrow.

There is a motion to discharge the Committee on Finance from the consideration of the joint resolution, and it went over until the next day. That was May 21. It went over until May 22. The Chair assumes that that motion is on the table under the rule which requires that a motion to discharge a committee shall lie over for one day, except by unanimous consent. Now the Senator moves to call up his motion. Is that the motion?

Mr. HARRIS. I move to call up my motion, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are already ordered upon it. The Senator from Georgia moves to call up his motion.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia demands the yeas and nays. Is the demand seconded?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am willing to have this matter go over and be voted on at noon on Saturday if there is any danger of there not being a quorum to-night. I have taken up less of the time of the Senate than any other Member of this body. I have not been treated with the courtesy that I deserve about this joint resolution, and I am not willing to yield anything. If the Senators will not let me have a vote on it, I will take up all the time of the Senate that I can to-morrow in showing the importance of this measure by reading from the report of two years ago.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think the Senator from Georgia, after offering this joint resolution months ago, is entitled to have a decision rendered on it at this session of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have the floor, please.

I have watched the Senator's interest in this question, and I have seen him repeatedly try to get a decision. The joint resolution was referred to a committee of the Senate and has been held there. Only two weeks ago we were promised that it would be reported the next day with some decision of the committee, and the matter was allowed to go over. No report has yet been made.

In all fairness to the Senator from Georgia, and in fairness to what he represents here, there ought to be a decision from that committee for or against this joint resolution, and the reasons ought to be given. None has been forthcoming, and he has proper ground to protest. In fact, the truth is that there are some committees in this body that do not intend that any information whatever shall be given about the extent of the profits that have been made. Another resolution is pending before a committee of which the Senator from Utah is a member, where there is no expense at all involved, but only authority asked for a committee of this body to request the President

for certain papers that they may think will be of importance; and that has been held up, too.

I urge that the Senate treat this Senator fairly, and let there be a decision. Never mind being against it. It is his day in court, and he has a right to have a hearing before adjournment. It is the one thing in which he has been interested; and here we are now on the very eve of this matter being postponed and no decision rendered.

I do not mind the committee reporting and saying that furnishing this information is inexpedient or that it is too expensive, but the Senator at least ought to have a hearing, and he ought to have a decision rendered here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must say that really, in the opinion of the Chair, he had no business to allow debate to proceed on this matter. A vote is being taken upon the motion of the Senator, and there will be a decision on it in a minute. The Senator from Georgia has demanded the yeas and nays, and the Chair asked if the request was seconded. The Secretary is counting to see if the demand for the yeas and nays is seconded, and at that stage debate is not in order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, may I suggest that at least the Senator from Georgia, when he agreed that this matter should go over for one day, never intended and never expected that his right to a roll call on the question should be surrendered, whatever the technical rule may provide. He relied upon the promise that was given him in reference to the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas rises to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, have not the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were requested, and the Chair is waiting for the Secretary to count. The Chair asked if the request was seconded.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But is not the motion to discharge the committee pending, with the yeas and nays ordered? Does not the Record show that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is asking for the yeas and nays on his motion.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; the Senator from Georgia merely called up his motion to discharge the committee, and asked for the yeas and nays that had already been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Record states that the yeas and nays had been ordered on it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And he now asks for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If it is the motion that the Senator calls up, if he is simply demanding the yeas and nays upon his motion, in the opinion of the Chair, that is a work of supererogation, because the Record shows that they have been ordered on that motion.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say that as far as I am personally concerned I have no objection whatever to taking a vote upon this matter to-day at 12 o'clock noon. I have too much confidence in the Senate of the United States even to suggest that we would not vote upon it or that we would hold it up more than long enough to explain what it means. Then, if the Senate wants to go into it, well and good; but I do not believe they will do it. As far as I am concerned, I have not any objection at all to unanimous consent being given to begin the consideration of the matter at 12 o'clock noon to-day, and to vote at 1 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may be allowed, I have no objection at all to making the agreement the Senator from Georgia asks for, but I should like a little time to make some inquiries in regard to the joint resolution. As it reads, it covers by direct language all the corporations in the United States.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to amend it.

Mr. LODGE. There are 365,000 of them; and the estimates are, as we are informed here, that the cost of the information will be over a million dollars.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, that is only on 35,000 of them.

Mr. LODGE. On 35,000?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. Well, it will cost a very large sum, and I should really like to know a little more about it than I do now; that is all. I only want to have time allowed to discuss it before the vote is taken.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I fully agree that the Senator from Georgia is entitled to some report from the committee. I am a member of the committee. We took up the subject some time ago, I think some two or three weeks ago. We had representatives of the Internal Revenue Bureau before us. I was greatly impressed myself with the amount of expense attendant upon the joint resolution if it was reported out favorably; but what impressed me more was the assurance that the preparation of the list required by the joint resolution would engage the attention of the staff of employees in the bureau for some six or seven months, as I remember, and at a time when they are now overwhelmed with the business which constitutes the chief work of the bureau.

I thought then, and I think now, that like a great many other similar resolutions that have been considered since I have been here, by the time the reports desired were in the subject matter would have become of no great or certainly no pressing importance. The great trouble with the work desired lies, first, in its cost in money, and, second, in the demoralization of the working force of a very important bureau for a long time.

If my recollection serves me right, at the time this hearing was had the committee took an adjournment for two or three days, when we were to receive further information, and I do not recall that the committee since that time has considered it.

I am perfectly willing, as the Senator from Utah says, to take a record vote upon it at 12 o'clock noon to-day. I have no objection whatever to it. I fully concede the justice of the suggestions made by the Senator from Georgia. The Senator from Georgia is entitled to a final consideration of the joint resolution; but the cost of the information and the time that will be required for its preparation, and which will monopolize practically the entire staff of the Internal Revenue Department for weeks to come, ought to be considered by the Senate.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, if there can be a vote on the matter at 12 o'clock noon, I will not ask for a vote to-night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator that if a unanimous-consent agreement is proposed, it should be stated definitely; but the Chair will remind the Senator that under the rule unanimous consent to fix a day for a final vote on a joint resolution requires the presence of a quorum when the agreement is made.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing to say to the Senator from Georgia now that even though a unanimous-consent agreement were not made here to-night he is entitled to a vote; and I am perfectly willing to have an understanding, if such a thing can be done, that the discussion shall not take more than an hour, and then that we shall vote upon the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest that since the vote is not upon the joint resolution, but is upon the motion to discharge the committee, it will not be necessary to call the roll.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If a unanimous-consent agreement is proposed, the Chair will ask whether or not the Senate agrees to it.

Mr. SMOOT. Will a unanimous consent of this kind suit the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], that on the convening of the Senate at 11 o'clock to-day the question will be immediately presented to the Senate, and at not later than 12 o'clock a vote will be taken upon the question as to whether the committee shall be discharged or not?

Mr. HARRIS. That is satisfactory to me, but not later than 12 o'clock.

Mr. SMOOT. Not later than 12 o'clock.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I suggest to the Senator that he put in that agreement that no Senator shall talk more than 10 minutes?

Mr. SMOOT. I really thought Senators would regard the propriety.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It will help to expedite business.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think any Senator is going to get up here and take the whole time. It would disgust every other Senator if he did.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has the agreement been made, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary is reducing it to writing, and as soon as it is so reduced, it will be reported to the Senate.

The Secretary will state it as he understands it.



The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent that at not later than 12 o'clock meridian on the calendar day of Saturday, June 5, 1920, the Senate will vote upon the motion made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] to discharge the Committee on Finance from further consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 146); and further that upon the convening of the Senate at 11 o'clock a. m., on said calendar day the motion will be at once taken up for consideration.

Mr. HARRIS. And a vote taken on the resolution itself not later than 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is already contained in the request. Is there any objection to the request for unanimous consent? The Chair hears none, and the Senate consents. The unanimous-consent agreement was reduced to writing, as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that immediately upon the convening of the Senate at 11 o'clock a. m., on the calendar day of Saturday, June 5, 1920, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] to discharge the Committee on Finance from the further consideration of Senate joint resolution 146, and that at not later than 12 o'clock meridian, on the said calendar day, the Senate will vote upon the said motion.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know how long it will be before the deficiency appropriation bill is received from the House, and I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to the consideration of the calendar under Rule VIII of bills to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none.

#### THE CALENDAR—BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) defining a peace treaty which shall assure to the people of the United States the attainment of the ends for which they entered the war, and declaring the policy of our Government to meet fully obligations to ourselves and to the world, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 529) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 600) for the relief of the heirs of Miss Susan A. Nicholas was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 174) for the relief of Emma H. Ridley was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1722) for the relief of Watson B. Dickerman, administrator of the estate of Charles Backman, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 168) to create a commission to investigate and report to Congress a plan on the questions involved in the financing of house construction and home ownership and Federal aid therefor was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2224) to incorporate the Recreation Association of America was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1660) to provide a division of tuberculosis in, and an advisory council for, the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2457) to provide for a library information service in the Bureau of Education was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 131) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil

War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over. The bill (S. 1448) for the relief of Jacob Nice was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over. The resolution (S. Res. 172) for the selection of a special committee to investigate the administration of the office of the Alien Property Custodian was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent to suspend the calling of the calendar, so that I may offer a resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The calendar is being called under unanimous consent.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But every bill called is being objected to, and we are going through the form of taking up time, when some business could be transacted.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that all the bills which have been passed over really should go to the calendar under Rule IX; they are objected to all the time. But it will not be much longer before we get to bills which have not been objected to.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I wish we might do some real business instead of calling the calendar and passing everything over.

Mr. KING. Would the Senator desire to have the Senate pass these bills which have been called and which have been passed over?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think I have heard an objection to every bill which has been called.

Mr. KING. I objected to several of them.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14335) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 to the bill, and agrees to the same with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 373) declaring that certain acts of Congress, joint resolutions, and proclamations shall be construed as if the war had ended and the present or existing emergency expired.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills:

H. R. 13976. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River, at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 13977. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Millvale Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

H. R. 13978. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near McKees Rocks Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives agreeing to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14335) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, receding from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and agreeing to the same with an amendment in lieu of said amendment, insert:

#### RIVER AND HARBOR WORK.

Readjustment of contracts: The sum of \$368,978.33 found to be due various contractors under the provisions of section 10 of the river and harbor appropriations act approved March 2, 1919, on certain contracts for work on river and harbor improvements entered into, but not completed prior to April 6, 1917, for work performed between April 6, 1917, and July 18, 1918, may be paid by the Secretary of War from any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the projects on which such work was performed.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I do not approve of the action of the House. I understand they had no record vote over there; indeed, I understand there was not a single speech made in behalf of this proposition; that the only speech that was made was in opposition to it.

It strikes me that it has come to a pretty pass when either branch of the American Congress, under the peculiar conditions which confront the District schools, should take such action as has been taken by the other branch of the American Congress.

I am not going to insist further, so far as I am concerned, on this amendment numbered 4, because I feel that the select committee which investigated the schools has done its duty. It made its report; it cited to the American Congress, both the House of Representatives and the Senate, what, in their opinion, were the conditions of the schools here, and made such recommendations as they thought would remedy the situation. It was a simple remedy, merely the change of the existing board, and the manner of the appointment. It provided for a survey, with a mere appropriation of \$15,000, whereby Congress by the next session might be advised of what would be best touching the school situation here.

The Senate has acted beautifully. Not only has it accepted the views of the members of the select committee which was directed by the Senate to investigate the schools, but it has insisted upon this amendment after the Senate had adopted it.

But the House of Representatives must take the responsibility, which it has taken, in leaving the schools of the District in the condition in which they will be left after the Congress adjourns to-day. It will be December before the Congress reconvenes. We are leaving on the people of the District of Columbia a board of education which the evidence presented before the committee investigating the public schools shows to be unfit for the discharge of their duties. The people of the District of Columbia are against them. They have placed the schools of the District at a very low ebb. The burden is upon the little children who must attend these schools, and we are adjourning to-day and leaving that condition upon the people here.

The responsibility is not any more upon the Senate, because we have done our duty. The House of Representatives has repudiated our action, and the responsibility for the condition which will prevail from now on until Congress reconvenes, when perhaps we can get some permanent legislation passed, must be borne by the other branch of Congress. It is a sad plight in which we have left the people, and the House must assume the responsibility.

I feel that I have discharged my duty and that the other members of the select committee have discharged their duty, and I shall not insist further on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from Wyoming that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 18, which the Secretary has read.

The motion was agreed to.

#### RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now take the recess already ordered.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock a. m. Saturday, June 5, 1920) the Senate took a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. Saturday, June 5, 1920.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate June 4 (legislative day of June 2), 1920.*

##### GOVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS.

Rear Admiral Joseph W. Oman, United States Navy, to be Governor of the Virgin Islands, ceded to the United States by Denmark, to date from April 8, 1919.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

John E. Kinnane, of Detroit, Mich., to be United States attorney, eastern district of Michigan. A reappointment, his term expiring August 8, 1920.

##### REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

John Thomas Joyce, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Durango, Colo., his present term expiring July 12, 1920. (Reappointment.)

#### PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Carpenter William H. Buchanan to be a chief carpenter in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1919.

##### POSTMASTERS.

###### ALABAMA.

John M. Graham to be postmaster at Stevenson, Ala., in place of J. M. Graham. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.

###### ARIZONA.

Don C. Babbitt to be postmaster at Mesa, Ariz., in place of D. C. Babbitt. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

###### CALIFORNIA.

Samuel T. Moore to be postmaster at Gilroy, Calif., in place of S. T. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920. William Weber to be postmaster at Soledad, Calif., in place of William Weber. Incumbent's commission expires June 27, 1920.

Henry T. Bott to be postmaster at Elsinore, Calif., in place of Charles Collins, resigned.

###### COLORADO.

Taylor B. Geer to be postmaster at Delta, Colo., in place of T. B. Geer. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

###### CONNECTICUT.

Charles W. Leet to be postmaster at Chester, Conn., in place of C. W. Leet. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

James E. Cuff to be postmaster at Danbury, Conn., in place of J. E. Cuff. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

###### DELAWARE.

Austin J. McCabe to be postmaster at Frankford, Del., in place of A. J. McCabe. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

###### GEORGIA.

James L. Heard to be postmaster at East Point, Ga., in place of J. C. McKenzie, resigned.

Jason Scarboro to be postmaster at Tifton, Ga., in place of W. H. Bennett, resigned.

###### ILLINOIS.

Oscar H. Johnson to be postmaster at Bowen, Ill., in place of O. H. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1920.

John F. Quinn to be postmaster at Joliet, Ill., in place of J. F. Quinn. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

Eli P. Sanders to be postmaster at Pawnee, Ill., in place of E. P. Sanders. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Molly Webster to be postmaster at Salem, Ill., in place of Molly Webster. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

###### INDIANA.

Edward H. Taylor to be postmaster at Knox, Ind., in place of E. H. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.

George W. Roy to be postmaster at Wolcottville, Ind., in place of G. W. Roy. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.

###### IOWA.

Embree F. Main to be postmaster at Hopkinton, Iowa, in place of E. F. Main. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.

S. Paul Figl to be postmaster at Renwick, Iowa, in place of S. P. Figl. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Charles V. Dautremont to be postmaster at Riverside, Iowa, in place of C. V. Dautremont. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.

Charles E. Dawson to be postmaster at Rockford, Iowa, in place of C. E. Dawson. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.

###### MAINE.

Sumner G. Brewer to be postmaster at Freeport, Me., in place of A. I. Curtis, resigned.

###### MASSACHUSETTS.

Joseph F. McManus to be postmaster at Norwood, Mass., in place of J. F. McManus. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1920.

###### MICHIGAN.

Clarence C. Hopkins to be postmaster at Breckenridge, Mich., in place of C. C. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.

Joseph M. Dodge to be postmaster at Cass City, Mich., in place of J. M. Dodge. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.



Sidney Reynolds to be postmaster at Howard City, Mich., in place of Sidney Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.

William B. Howlett to be postmaster at Jonesville, Mich., in place of W. B. Howlett. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.

Richard W. Doyle to be postmaster at Merrill, Mich., in place of R. W. Doyle. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

Hiram A. Cole to be postmaster at Paw Paw, Mich., in place of H. A. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

#### MISSISSIPPI.

Kirk M. Heflin to be postmaster at Baldwin, Miss., in place of K. M. Heflin. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

Andrew J. Darden to be postmaster at Centerville, Miss., in place of A. J. Darden. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

#### NEVADA.

Charles W. Brown to be postmaster at Gardnerville, Nev., in place of R. W. Gale, resigned.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE.

William H. Benson to be postmaster at Derry, N. H., in place of W. H. Benson. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Thomas Smith to be postmaster at Exeter, N. H., in place of Thomas Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

James A. Brahaney to be postmaster at Milford, N. H., in place of J. A. Brahaney. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

#### NEW YORK.

David J. Sheridan to be postmaster at Cambridge, N. Y., in place of D. J. Sheridan. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John Toole to be postmaster at Hudson Falls, N. Y., in place of John Toole. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Robert McC. Halpin to be postmaster at Hyde Park, N. Y., in place of R. McC. Halpin. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

Richard J. Gilmer to be postmaster at Kings Park, N. Y., in place of R. J. Gilmer. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

William H. Nolan to be postmaster at Little Falls, N. Y., in place of W. H. Nolan. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1920.

Ralph E. Wilder to be postmaster at Newark, N. Y., in place of R. E. Wilder. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Louis G. Quackenbush to be postmaster at Oneida, N. Y., in place of L. G. Quackenbush. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.

John Lenney to be postmaster at Potsdam, N. Y., in place of John Lenney. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

John E. Townsend to be postmaster at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., in place of J. E. Townsend. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Cornelius J. Carey to be postmaster at Saranac Lake, N. Y., in place of C. J. Carey. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

George W. Runyon to be postmaster at Spring Valley, N. Y., in place of G. W. Runyon. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Richard F. Hayes to be postmaster at Ticonderoga, N. Y., in place of R. F. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1920.

Thomas A. Meeker to be postmaster at Waterford, N. Y., in place of T. A. Meeker. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

#### NORTH CAROLINA.

Junius C. Wren to be postmaster at Silver City, N. C., in place of O. B. Webster, removed.

Adolphus S. Ruggles to be postmaster at Southern Pines, N. C., in place of A. S. Ruggles. Incumbent's commission expired June 11, 1920.

#### OHIO.

Michael J. Callaghan to be postmaster at Bellevue, Ohio, in place of M. J. Callaghan. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

#### OKLAHOMA.

Jenie L. Burke to be postmaster at Hobart, Okla., in place of J. L. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1920.

Herbert A. Seaton to be postmaster at Mooreland, Okla., in place of H. A. Seaton. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

#### OREGON.

John P. Houston to be postmaster at Vale, Oreg., in place of J. P. Houston. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

#### PENNSYLVANIA.

Milo G. Conlin to be postmaster at Duquesne, Pa., in place of M. G. Conlin. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

Joseph Smith to be postmaster at Elkland, Pa., in place of Joseph Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

Otis S. Quinby to be postmaster at Springboro, Pa., in place of O. S. Quinby. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.

Ira F. Cutshall to be postmaster at Tarentum, Pa., in place of I. F. Cutshall. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Laurence J. Casey to be postmaster at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in place of L. J. Casey. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

#### SOUTH DAKOTA.

Robert H. Benner to be postmaster at Gary, S. Dak., in place of M. H. Godron, resigned.

#### TENNESSEE.

Richard H. Green to be postmaster at Covington, Tenn., in place of R. H. Green. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

#### WEST VIRGINIA.

Richard C. Cooper to be postmaster at Farmington, W. Va., in place of R. C. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

James J. Dunn to be postmaster at Rowlesburg, W. Va., in place of J. J. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

#### WISCONSIN.

Gilbert C. Roberts to be postmaster at La Farge, Wis., in place of G. C. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

Robert E. Bundy to be postmaster at Menomonie, Wis., in place of R. E. Bundy. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

Alfred W. Stiles to be postmaster at River Falls, Wis., in place of A. W. Stiles. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Myra W. Blanding to be postmaster at St. Croix Falls, Wis., in place of M. W. Blanding. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 4 (legislative day of June 2), 1920.*

#### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

John E. Kinnane to be United States attorney, eastern district of Michigan.

#### REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Hilmar Schmidt to be register of the land office at Wausau, Wis.

#### RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONIES.

George G. E. Neill to be receiver of public moneys at Helena, Mont.

William A. White to be receiver of public moneys at Walla Walla, Wash.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE CONSULAR SERVICE.

##### *Consuls general.*

##### CLASS 3.

Carlton Bailey Hurst.  
William Coffin.  
Evan E. Young.  
Edwin S. Cunningham.  
David F. Wilber.  
Carl F. Deichman.

##### *Consuls.*

##### CLASS 3.

Roger Culver Tredwell.  
George H. Pickerell.  
John E. Kehl.  
Arminius T. Haeberle.  
De Witt C. Poole, jr.  
Charles S. Winans.  
Chester W. Martin.  
Philip Holland.  
William P. Kent.  
John K. Caldwell.  
Wesley Frost.

Calvin Milton Hitch.  
North Winship.  
George E. Chamberlin.  
Hernando de Soto.  
Maxwell K. Moorhead.  
Frederick T. F. Dumont.  
Otis A. Glazebrook.  
Henry S. Culver.  
Cornelius Ferris, jr.  
William Dawson.  
Nelson T. Johnson.  
Edward J. Norton.  
Frederick Simpich.  
Lewis W. Haskell.  
Douglas Jenkins.  
Claude I. Dawson.  
John Q. Wood.

## CLASS 4.

Ross Hazeltine.  
Jesse B. Jackson.  
Edwin L. Neville.  
Ezra M. Lawton.  
José de Olivares.  
W. Roderick Dorsey.  
Joseph E. Haven.  
John A. Gamon.  
Wallace J. Young.  
Harry A. McBride.  
Ely E. Palmer.  
Stuart K. Lupton.  
Charles M. Freeman.  
Homer M. Byington.  
Clarence E. Gauss.  
Ralph C. Busser.  
William W. Masterson.  
Graham H. Kemper.  
David J. D. Myers.  
Alfred W. Donegan.  
Tracy Lay.  
Emil Sauer.  
Harold D. Clum.  
Leslie A. Davis.  
Wilbur T. Gracey.  
Clarence Carrigan.  
Mahlon Fay Perkins.

## CLASS 5.

John K. Davis.  
Charles E. Asbury.  
Thomas D. Bowman.  
Arthur C. Frost.  
Harry Campbell.  
George S. Messersmith.  
Alfred R. Thomson.  
Claude E. Guyant.  
John W. Dye.  
Edward A. Dow.  
Henry C. A. Damm.  
Kenneth S. Patton.  
Wilbur Keblinger.  
Bertie M. Rasmusen.  
Oscar S. Heizer.  
Benjamin F. Chase.  
Lucien N. Sullivan.  
Edward I. Nathan.  
Charles M. Hathaway, jr.  
James B. Young.  
Charles H. Albrecht.  
Albro L. Burnell.  
Addison E. Southard.  
Henry P. Starrett.  
Edwin Carl Kemp.  
John M. Savage.  
Walter F. Boyle.  
O. Gaylord Marsh.  
Hasell H. Dick.  
Thomas B. L. Layton.  
Henry H. Balch.  
Thornwell Haynes.  
Mason Mitchell.  
Henry M. Wolcott.  
Theodore Jaeckel.  
John R. Putnam.  
Louis G. Dreyfus, jr.  
J. Klahr Huddle.  
Dana C. Sycks.  
Lowell C. Pinkerton.

Frank C. Lee.  
Bartley F. Yost.  
Frank Bohr.  
Keith Merrill.  
Leslie E. Reed.  
William J. Yerby.  
Hamilton C. Claiborne.  
W. Duval Brown.  
Ernest L. Ives.  
G. Russell Taggart.  
John J. C. Watson.  
Charles E. Allen.  
James G. Carter.  
Donald D. Shepard.  
Henry C. Von Struve.  
Robertson Honey.  
William H. Hunt.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE CONSULAR SERVICE.

## Consuls.

## CLASS 3.

Arthur N. Young.  
Charles D. Westcott.

## CLASS 4.

Frederic E. Lee.  
Dana G. Munro.  
Maurice Parmelee.

## CLASS 6.

Robert W. Heingartner.

## CLASS 7.

Herbert O. Williams.  
Winthrop R. Scott.  
Renwick S. McNiece.  
Robert W. Jones.  
Philip D. Wesson.  
Monnett B. Davis.  
Avra M. Warren.  
William F. Burns.  
Sanford Griffiths.  
Leighton Hope.  
W. M. Parker Mitchell.  
John Douglas Wise.  
George J. Crosby.  
Newton Adams.  
George Orr.  
John Corrigan, jr.  
Edgar C. Soule.  
Chester W. Davis.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

## QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

*To be colonel.*

Lieut. Col. Theodore B. Hacker.

## MEDICAL CORPS.

*To be majors.*

Capt. Haskett L. Conner.  
Capt. Edward B. Macon.  
Capt. Percy J. Carroll.  
Capt. James V. Fallis.

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

*To be colonel.*

Lieut. Col. Charles W. Kutz.

*To be lieutenant colonel.*

Maj. Gilbert A. Youngberg.

*To be majors.*

Capt. Donald H. Connolly.  
Capt. Raymond F. Fowler.

*To be captains.*

First Lieut. Lucius Du B. Clay.  
First Lieut. Lloyd E. Mielenz.  
First Lieut. Pierre A. Agnew.  
First Lieut. Alexander M. Neilson.  
First Lieut. Hoel S. Bishop, jr.  
First Lieut. Charles E. McKee.  
First Lieut. Robert H. Elliott.  
First Lieut. Samuel D. Sturgis, jr.  
First Lieut. Thomas H. Nixon.  
First Lieut. Anderson T. W. Moore.  
First Lieut. Reginald Whitaker.  
First Lieut. Eugene M. Caffey.  
Provisional First Lieut. Leonard B. Gallagher.  
Provisional First Lieut. F. Russel Lyons.  
Provisional First Lieut. Fernando T. Norcross.  
Provisional First Lieut. William N. Thomas, jr.



## CAVALRY ARM.

*To be captains.*

First Lieut. Joseph S. Tate.  
 First Lieut. Arthur M. Harper.  
 First Lieut. John W. Confer, jr.  
 First Lieut. Herbert N. Schwarzkopf.  
 First Lieut. Robert N. Kunz.  
 First Lieut. Charles S. Kilburn.  
 First Lieut. Charles R. Johnson, jr.  
 First Lieut. Bertrand Morrow.  
 First Lieut. Wallace J. Redner.  
 First Lieut. Guy H. Doshier.  
 First Lieut. Myer S. Silver.

*To be first lieutenants.*

Second Lieut. William F. H. Godson, jr.  
 Second Lieut. William L. Barriger.  
 Second Lieut. Frederick W. Fenn (Ordnance Department).  
 Second Lieut. Elmer Q. Oliphant.  
 Second Lieut. Jonathan L. Holman.  
 Second Lieut. Francis E. Rundell.  
 Second Lieut. George B. Hudson.  
 Second Lieut. Harry C. Mewshaw.  
 Second Lieut. Peter L. A. Dye.  
 Second Lieut. Frank T. Turner.  
 Second Lieut. George G. Eddy.  
 Second Lieut. Charles E. Morrison.  
 Second Lieut. Christian Knudsen.  
 Second Lieut. Francis B. Valentine.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas T. Thornburgh.  
 Second Lieut. David A. Taylor.  
 Second Lieut. Ronald A. Hicks.  
 Second Lieut. Elmer V. Stansbury.  
 Second Lieut. Edwin L. Hogan.  
 Second Lieut. John C. Hamilton.  
 Second Lieut. Mark Rhoads.  
 Second Lieut. Joseph K. Baker.  
 Second Lieut. Charles W. Leng, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Albert W. Johnson.  
 Second Lieut. Willard A. Holbrook, jr.  
 Second Lieut. James C. Styron.  
 Second Lieut. Samuel P. Walker, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Fred G. Sherrill.  
 Second Lieut. Sol M. Lipman.  
 Second Lieut. Ira P. Swift.  
 Second Lieut. Harris F. Scherer.  
 Second Lieut. James B. Rivers.  
 Second Lieut. Harrison H. D. Heilberg.  
 Second Lieut. Paul A. Donnally.  
 Second Lieut. William W. Jervey.  
 Second Lieut. William H. Wenstrom.  
 Second Lieut. Hugh B. Waddell.  
 Second Lieut. James H. Phillips.  
 Second Lieut. John E. Leahy.  
 Second Lieut. Frederick W. Drury.  
 Second Lieut. Virgil F. Shaw.  
 Second Lieut. Paul A. Noel.  
 Second Lieut. Hugh F. T. Hoffman.  
 Second Lieut. David S. Holbrook.  
 Second Lieut. William D. McNair.  
 Second Lieut. William J. Crowe.  
 Second Lieut. Charles H. Noble.  
 Second Lieut. Charles H. Bryan.  
 Second Lieut. John H. Collier.  
 Second Lieut. Vincent C. McAlevy.  
 Second Lieut. George G. Elms.  
 Second Lieut. Ralph F. Stearley.  
 Second Lieut. Donald H. Nelson.  
 Second Lieut. Horace P. Sampson.  
 Second Lieut. Dale W. Maher.  
 Second Lieut. Robert J. Merrick.  
 Second Lieut. William L. McEnery.  
 Second Lieut. Martin A. Fennell.  
 Second Lieut. Albert S. J. Stovall, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Daniel P. Buckland.  
 Second Lieut. Fred W. Makinney, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Robert W. Child.

## FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

*To be captains.*

First Lieut. Woodrow W. Woodbridge.  
 First Lieut. Wilbur C. Carlan.  
 First Lieut. Edmund B. Edwards.  
 First Lieut. John H. Carriker.  
 First Lieut. William G. Gough.

First Lieut. Azel W. McNeal.  
 First Lieut. William B. Wright, jr.  
 First Lieut. Wendell L. Bevan.  
 First Lieut. Richard T. Guthrie.  
 First Lieut. Ittai A. Luke.  
 First Lieut. Alan A. Campbell.  
 First Lieut. Oscar B. Ralls, jr.  
 First Lieut. John H. Larkin.  
 First Lieut. George J. Downey.  
 First Lieut. Wallace W. Crawford.  
 First Lieut. Christiancy Pickett.

*To be first lieutenants.*

Second Lieut. William H. Barlow.  
 Second Lieut. Ernest C. Norman.  
 Second Lieut. Charles R. Gildart.  
 Second Lieut. Gerald A. O'Rourke.  
 Second Lieut. Charles E. Hixon.  
 Second Lieut. Bryan Evans.  
 Second Lieut. Francis A. March, 3d.  
 Second Lieut. John S. Winn, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Roger W. Autry.  
 Second Lieut. Myrl M. Miller.  
 Second Lieut. Alfred N. Bergman.  
 Second Lieut. Stuart M. Bevans.  
 Second Lieut. John H. Lewis, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Alfred M. Gruenther.  
 Second Lieut. Benjamin M. Hedrick.  
 Second Lieut. Williston B. Palmer.  
 Second Lieut. Robert G. Gard.  
 Second Lieut. Herbert M. Jones.  
 Second Lieut. Orville W. Martin.  
 Second Lieut. John P. Kennedy.  
 Second Lieut. Alexander S. Bennet.  
 Second Lieut. George S. Price.  
 Second Lieut. Phillip S. Lauben.  
 Second Lieut. Wyburn D. Brown.  
 Second Lieut. Robert M. Montague.  
 Second Lieut. Charles P. Jones.  
 Second Lieut. Anthony C. McAuliffe.  
 Second Lieut. Robert L. Johnson.  
 Second Lieut. Albert R. S. Barden.  
 Second Lieut. Romeo F. Regnier.  
 Second Lieut. Louis B. Ely.  
 Second Lieut. Julius E. Slack.  
 Second Lieut. Bertram F. Hayford.  
 Second Lieut. Ernest A. Bixby.  
 Second Lieut. Robert R. Raymond, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Ernest J. Riley.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas B. Hedekin.  
 Second Lieut. Joseph V. Phelps.  
 Second Lieut. Charles N. McFarland.  
 Second Lieut. Charles A. Pyle.  
 Second Lieut. Alexander G. Kirby.  
 Second Lieut. Herbert W. Semmelmeier.  
 Second Lieut. William W. Barton.  
 Second Lieut. Maurice P. Chadwick.  
 Second Lieut. Foster J. Tate.  
 Second Lieut. Richard T. Bennisson.  
 Second Lieut. Henry J. D. Meyer.  
 Second Lieut. Elton F. Hammond.  
 Second Lieut. Francis G. McGill.  
 Second Lieut. Oscar A. Saunders.  
 Second Lieut. John J. Burns.  
 Second Lieut. Leslie E. Jacoby.  
 Second Lieut. Clarence J. Kanaga.  
 Second Lieut. Edwin V. Kerr.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas McGregor.  
 Second Lieut. James E. Parker.  
 Second Lieut. Edward L. Strohbehn.  
 Second Lieut. Maurice K. Kurtz.  
 Second Lieut. Eugene McGinley.  
 Second Lieut. Augustine F. Shea.  
 Second Lieut. Marion P. Echols.  
 Second Lieut. Francis O. Wood.  
 Second Lieut. Ellis V. Williamson.  
 Second Lieut. John B. Murphy.  
 Second Lieut. Michael G. Smith.  
 Second Lieut. Henry E. Sanderson, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Hugh G. Elliott, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Douglas A. Olcott.  
 Second Lieut. Walter T. O'Reilly.  
 Second Lieut. Edward O. Hopkins.  
 Second Lieut. Urban Niblo.  
 Second Lieut. John M. Works.

## COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

*To be captains.*

First Lieut. Clarence E. Cotter.  
 First Lieut. Gordon B. Welch.  
 First Lieut. Cedric F. Maguire.  
 First Lieut. Edward E. Murphy.  
 First Lieut. Marshall M. Williams, jr.  
 First Lieut. Edward C. Seeds.  
 First Lieut. Edison A. Lynn.  
 First Lieut. Guy H. Drewry.  
 First Lieut. Raphael S. Chavin.  
 First Lieut. John L. Scott.  
 First Lieut. Alva F. Englehart.  
 First Lieut. Harold R. Jackson.  
 First Lieut. Morris K. Barroll, jr.  
 First Lieut. Walter W. Warner.  
 First Lieut. Walter F. Vander Hyden.  
 First Lieut. Ira A. Crump.  
 First Lieut. Elbert L. Ford, jr.  
 First Lieut. James L. Hayden.  
 First Lieut. Scott B. Ritchie.  
 First Lieut. George S. Beurket.  
 First Lieut. Burnett R. Olmsted.  
 First Lieut. Joel G. Holmes.  
 First Lieut. James A. Code, jr.  
 First Lieut. William Sackville.  
 First Lieut. Leroy H. Lohmann.  
 First Lieut. Christian G. Foltz.  
 First Lieut. Aaron Bradshaw, jr.  
 First Lieut. Harry R. Pierce.  
 First Lieut. Lawrence C. Mitchell.  
 First Lieut. Alexander H. Campbell.  
 First Lieut. Marvil G. Armstrong.  
 First Lieut. John R. Nygaard.  
 First Lieut. James L. Keane.  
 First Lieut. Albert A. Allen.

*To be first lieutenants.*

Second Lieut. David H. Whittier.  
 Second Lieut. Clarence E. Burgher.  
 Second Lieut. Walter E. Bullock.  
 Second Lieut. Rollin F. Risen.  
 Second Lieut. William I. Allen.  
 Second Lieut. George R. Burgess.  
 Second Lieut. Paul L. Harter.  
 Second Lieut. Lester DeL. Flory.  
 Second Lieut. Isaac H. Ritchie.  
 Second Lieut. Roy A. Moore.  
 Second Lieut. Hobart Hewett.  
 Second Lieut. Richard T. Rick.  
 Second Lieut. Waldemar S. Broberg.  
 Second Lieut. Nathaniel A. Burnell, 2d.  
 Second Lieut. James L. Harbaugh, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Willard G. Wyman.  
 Second Lieut. John L. Whitelaw.  
 Second Lieut. Henry B. Nichols.  
 Second Lieut. Charles F. Wilson.  
 Second Lieut. George W. MacMillan.  
 Second Lieut. Dean Luce.  
 Second Lieut. Frederick B. Dodge, jr.  
 Second Lieut. William H. J. Dunham.  
 Second Lieut. Raymond F. Kilroy.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas L. Waters.  
 Second Lieut. Charles M. Wolff.  
 Second Lieut. Robert W. Crichtlow, jr.  
 Second Lieut. James W. Boyd.  
 Second Lieut. Galen M. Taylor.  
 Second Lieut. Edgar M. Gregory.  
 Second Lieut. William R. Bready.  
 Second Lieut. John C. Hyland, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas G. Cranford, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Edwin R. Samsey.  
 Second Lieut. Horace Speed, jr.  
 Second Lieut. John H. Madison.  
 Second Lieut. Halvor H. Myrah.  
 Second Lieut. David B. Latimer.  
 Second Lieut. Gordon L. Chapline.

## INFANTRY ARM.

*To be colonels.*

Lieut. Col. William Wallace.  
 Lieut. Col. Ferdinand W. Kobbe.

*To be lieutenant colonels.*

Maj. George L. Byroade.  
 Maj. Edward S. Walton.  
 Maj. Alfred T. Smith.  
 Maj. Fred L. Munson.

*To be major.*

Capt. Gustave A. Wieser.

*To be captains.*

First Lieut. Hugh P. Schively.  
 First Lieut. John D. Joanidy.  
 First Lieut. Gilmer M. Bell.  
 First Lieut. Roy Sloan.  
 First Lieut. Bryce F. Martin.  
 First Lieut. Glenn D. Hufford.  
 First Lieut. Paul R. Hudson.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Hall.  
 First Lieut. Benjamin H. Hensley.  
 First Lieut. Hawthorne C. Gray.  
 First Lieut. Donald J. Neumuller.  
 First Lieut. Jerome Pickett.  
 First Lieut. Lebbeus M. Cornish.  
 First Lieut. William S. Rumbough.  
 First Lieut. Thomas L. McMurray.  
 First Lieut. Hiram G. Fry.  
 First Lieut. Richard W. Cooksey.  
 First Lieut. Edwin W. Grimmer.  
 First Lieut. George A. Murray.  
 First Lieut. Joseph E. Young.  
 First Lieut. Henry T. J. Weishaar.  
 First Lieut. John E. Stullken.  
 First Lieut. Herman H. Meyer.  
 First Lieut. Carleton More.  
 First Lieut. Edward P. Sheppard.  
 First Lieut. Henry J. Matchett.  
 First Lieut. Vincent S. Burton.  
 First Lieut. Griffith Wight.  
 First Lieut. Curtis P. Miller.  
 First Lieut. John W. Bulger.  
 First Lieut. Roy W. Voegel.  
 First Lieut. Vernon L. Burge.  
 First Lieut. Simon Fostiak.  
 First Lieut. Edwin L. Dittmar.  
 First Lieut. Frank M. Child.  
 First Lieut. Frederic M. Lee.  
 First Lieut. Hurley E. Fuller.  
 First Lieut. Larry McHale.  
 First Lieut. John P. Horan.  
 First Lieut. Augustus B. O'Connell.  
 First Lieut. Charles C. Fitzhugh.

*To be first lieutenants.*

Second Lieut. Harold W. Gould.  
 Second Lieut. George B. Barth.  
 Second Lieut. Harry B. Sherman.  
 Second Lieut. John T. Newland.  
 Second Lieut. Carroll Tye.  
 Second Lieut. Benjamin R. McBride.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas Q. Donaldson, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Philip E. Gallagher.  
 Second Lieut. Carroll K. Leeper.  
 Second Lieut. Edward N. Jones, 3d.  
 Second Lieut. Harold B. Lewis.  
 Second Lieut. Charles Q. Lifsey.  
 Second Lieut. Hugh McC. Wilson, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Dwight T. Francis.  
 Second Lieut. William N. Davis.  
 Second Lieut. Dorr Hazlehurst.  
 Second Lieut. Robert T. Foster.  
 Second Lieut. Edwin D. Dando.  
 Second Lieut. Frederick von H. Kimble.  
 Second Lieut. Charles M. Wells.  
 Second Lieut. William B. Miller.  
 Second Lieut. Richard C. Babbitt.  
 Second Lieut. Hammond McD. Monroe.  
 Second Lieut. John W. Middleton.  
 Second Lieut. Frank J. Cunningham.  
 Second Lieut. Edward W. Smith.  
 Second Lieut. John B. Sherman.  
 Second Lieut. John J. Breen.  
 Second Lieut. James A. Kehoe.  
 Second Lieut. Frederick Pearson.  
 Second Lieut. Charles F. Colson.  
 Second Lieut. Donald F. Carroll.



Second Lieut. Robert A. Schow.  
 Second Lieut. John H. Stokes, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Jesse E. Graham.  
 Second Lieut. Jerome D. Cambre.  
 Second Lieut. Burrowes G. Stevens.  
 Second Lieut. Alexander T. McCone.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas M. Brinkley.  
 Second Lieut. John K. Buchanan.  
 Second Lieut. Ivins LaR. Browne.  
 Second Lieut. Kenneth W. Leslie.  
 Second Lieut. Beverly St. G. Tucker.  
 Second Lieut. Vincent J. Conrad.  
 Second Lieut. Reginald W. Hubbell.  
 Second Lieut. John M. Tatum.  
 Second Lieut. Paul W. Kendall.  
 Second Lieut. John F. Farley.  
 Second Lieut. Charles H. Moore, jr.  
 Second Lieut. James W. Freeman.  
 Second Lieut. Alexander J. Mackenzie.  
 Second Lieut. Wiley V. Carter.  
 Second Lieut. Wilbur E. Dunkelberg.  
 Second Lieut. James H. C. Hill.  
 Second Lieut. Victor C. Broome.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas R. Denny.  
 Second Lieut. Frank M. Corzelli.  
 Second Lieut. Julius L. Piland.  
 Second Lieut. Arthur Pulsifer.  
 Second Lieut. Farrin A. Hillard.  
 Second Lieut. William J. Mason.  
 Second Lieut. Elliott Watkins.  
 Second Lieut. Francis J. Gillespie.  
 Second Lieut. Jessie L. Gibney.  
 Second Lieut. Robert H. Vesey.  
 Second Lieut. Clarence M. Mendenhall, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Kester L. Hastings.  
 Second Lieut. George McK. Williamson, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Howard W. Brimmer.  
 Second Lieut. Charles M. Smith, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Albert B. Goodin.  
 Second Lieut. Walter J. Muller.  
 Second Lieut. Harry L. Rogers, jr.  
 Second Lieut. George B. Conrad.  
 Second Lieut. William S. Murray.  
 Second Lieut. Harry Krieger.  
 Second Lieut. Raymond W. Odor.  
 Second Lieut. James C. Welch.  
 Second Lieut. Miner W. Bonwell.  
 Second Lieut. John P. Pence.  
 Second Lieut. Joseph M. Glasgow.  
 Second Lieut. Elmer M. Jenkins.  
 Second Lieut. James L. Keasler.  
 Second Lieut. Rutherford D. McGiffert.  
 Second Lieut. Richard B. Wheeler.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas R. Aaron.  
 Second Lieut. Charles L. Gorman.  
 Second Lieut. Forrest E. Cookson.  
 Second Lieut. Carl S. Molitor.  
 Second Lieut. Harlan N. Hartness.  
 Second Lieut. Carl Robinson.  
 Second Lieut. Ernest M. Brannon.  
 Second Lieut. Luther L. Hill.  
 Second Lieut. John W. Sheehy.  
 Second Lieut. John R. Vance.  
 Second Lieut. Richard P. Ovenshine.  
 Second Lieut. Leo C. Paquet.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas M. Crawford.  
 Second Lieut. Carlisle V. Allan.  
 Second Lieut. John E. McCarthy.  
 Second Lieut. Leander D. Syme.  
 Second Lieut. Leroy C. Wilson.  
 Second Lieut. Syril E. Faine.  
 Second Lieut. Arthur M. Parsons.  
 Second Lieut. Harry W. Barrick.  
 Second Lieut. William T. Van de Graaff.  
 Second Lieut. Howard R. Perry, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Edwin H. Young.  
 Second Lieut. Nathan A. Smith.  
 Second Lieut. Gerald St. C. Mickle.  
 Second Lieut. Benjamin R. Farrar.  
 Second Lieut. Walter S. Winn, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Edwin H. Bowes.  
 Second Lieut. Edwin M. Sutherland.  
 Second Lieut. Joseph A. Holly.  
 Second Lieut. Robert F. Carter.  
 Second Lieut. Nathan F. Twining.

Second Lieut. L. Hoyt Rockafellow.  
 Second Lieut. Percy E. Hunt.  
 Second Lieut. Roland W. McNamee.  
 Second Lieut. John C. Raaen.  
 Second Lieut. Winfred G. Skelton.  
 Second Lieut. Lambert B. Cain.  
 Second Lieut. Edmund B. Seebree.  
 Second Lieut. Ignatius L. Donnelly.  
 Second Lieut. Merritt B. Booth.  
 Second Lieut. Raymond C. Barlow.  
 Second Lieut. Frank G. Davis.  
 Second Lieut. Emmett J. Bean.  
 Second Lieut. Donald A. Fay.  
 Second Lieut. Kenneth Pierce.  
 Second Lieut. John Endler.  
 Second Lieut. John D. Armstrong.  
 Second Lieut. John V. Dommoney.  
 Second Lieut. James V. Cole.  
 Second Lieut. Ralph B. Kindley.  
 Second Lieut. John A. Bruckner, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Clarence A. Frank.  
 Second Lieut. Clarkson D. McNary.  
 Second Lieut. Bernard A. Byrne, jr.  
 Second Lieut. George L. Dillaway, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Warren W. Christian.  
 Second Lieut. Robert B. Hutchins.  
 Second Lieut. Joseph W. Kullman.  
 Second Lieut. George D. Rogers.  
 Second Lieut. Landon G. Daniel.  
 Second Lieut. Irvin Alexander.  
 Second Lieut. George E. Bruner.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas H. Dameron.  
 Second Lieut. Roger S. Eyarts.  
 Second Lieut. Kenneth S. Olson.  
 Second Lieut. Robert M. Springer.  
 Second Lieut. Russell J. Nelson.  
 Second Lieut. Simon Foss.  
 Second Lieut. Edward M. Starr.  
 Second Lieut. Joseph S. Bradley.  
 Second Lieut. Arthur L. Moore.  
 Second Lieut. Ralph H. Bassett.  
 Second Lieut. Harold A. Brown.  
 Second Lieut. Donald C. Hardin.  
 Second Lieut. Wayne C. Zimmerman.  
 Second Lieut. John T. Keeley.  
 Second Lieut. Joseph C. Odell.  
 Second Lieut. Josiah T. Dalbey.  
 Second Lieut. Logan O. Shutt.  
 Second Lieut. Stuart Little.  
 Second Lieut. Hilton E. Heineke.  
 Second Lieut. John F. Lavagnino.  
 Second Lieut. Royal W. Park.  
 Second Lieut. Philip McI. Whitney.  
 Second Lieut. Christopher Hildebrand.  
 Second Lieut. Joseph H. Warren.  
 Second Lieut. John D. Frederick.  
 Second Lieut. Richard R. Coursey.  
 Second Lieut. Dwight L. Adams.  
 Second Lieut. Lester G. Degnan.  
 Second Lieut. Henry B. Sheets.  
 Second Lieut. Archie W. Cooley.  
 Second Lieut. William R. McMaster.  
 Second Lieut. Paul R. Carl.  
 Second Lieut. Cornelius E. O'Connor.  
 Second Lieut. Joseph A. Cranston, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Maurice L. Rosenthal.  
 Second Lieut. Willard L. Isaacs.  
 Second Lieut. William B. Kean, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Harold R. Emery.  
 Second Lieut. David S. McLean.  
 Second Lieut. William J. Moroney.  
 Second Lieut. Russell L. Williamson.  
 Second Lieut. Howard D. Johnston.  
 Second Lieut. Franklin L. Rash.  
 Second Lieut. Edgar H. Snodgrass.  
 Second Lieut. Claude D. Ferenbaugh.  
 Second Lieut. Adna C. Hamilton.  
 Second Lieut. Harold S. Ruth.  
 Second Lieut. Sterling E. Whitesides, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Lewis S. Sorley, jr.  
 Second Lieut. Albert C. Wedemeyer.  
 Second Lieut. John L. Denny.  
 Second Lieut. Roswell B. Hart.  
 Second Lieut. Herbert J. Riess.  
 Second Lieut. Henry I. Szymanski.

Second Lieut. Ulric L. Fomby.  
 Second Lieut. Frederick B. Porter.  
 Second Lieut. Bryan S. Halter.  
 Second Lieut. Hughes Steele.

# APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

*To be a lieutenant commander.*

Harold W. Boynton.

*To be a lieutenant.*

Bruce G. Leighton.

*To be lieutenants (junior grade).*

Roy K. Jones,  
 Robert L. Porter, jr., and  
 Harold F. Ely.

*To be a surgeon with the rank of lieutenant commander.*

Irving W. Robbins.

*To be an assistant surgeon with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).*

Bernard L. Toothaker.

*To be assistant dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).*

Hugh R. Alexander and  
 John W. Grassl.

*To be a naval constructor with the rank of captain.*

William P. Robert.

*To be a naval constructor with the rank of commander.*

Isaac I. Yates.

*To be a chief boatswain.*

Ralph B. Wallace.

*To be chief gunners.*

Raymond A. Walker and  
 Edgar C. Wortman.

*To be a chief pay clerk.*

Wallace D. Chace.

*To be a chief carpenter.*

William H. Buchanan.

# POSTMASTERS.

## ALABAMA.

Hortense Rowe, Camp Hill.  
 James F. Hodge, Carrollton.  
 Sophie Harris, Childersburg.  
 James F. Manley, Citronville.  
 Rush S. Hickman, Ensley.  
 James W. Snipes, Florala.  
 Sidney A. Borom, Hurtsboro.  
 William C. Starnes, Lanett.  
 James B. Hamric, Midland City.  
 Oscar Sheffield, Pine Hill.  
 Ernest A. Townsend, Tuscaloosa.  
 William W. Perry, West Blocton.

## ALASKA.

Charles H. Scheffler, Cordova.  
 Zina M. Bradford, Juneau.  
 William E. Root, Seward.  
 Martin Conway, Skagway.

## ARKANSAS.

Hamlet Goudelock, Eureka Springs.  
 Joseph W. Cheairs, Tillar.  
 Robert A. Choate, Tuckerman.  
 Bishop H. Harper, Wilmot.  
 Stephen I. Garrett, Altheimer.  
 Isham V. Echols, Cotton Plant.  
 Red Thomas, Fordyce.  
 Bertha E. Millian, Lexa.  
 Lulu Brown, Stephens.  
 Roy Wilson, Tyronza.  
 John W. Pinnell, Walnut Ridge.

## CALIFORNIA.

Rufus A. Berry, Berkeley.  
 Joseph C. Beard, Burlingame.  
 Arthur F. Donaldson, Bryon.  
 Cary D. McNeil, Corona.  
 Melissa B. Wilson, Dixon.  
 Nell M. Ellis, El Segundo.  
 Eileen J. Shrieve, Englemin.  
 John H. Bacon, Fellows.  
 Fleming J. Mathews, Fort Jones.

Charles F. Evers, Fortuna.  
 Edward M. Drury, Fowler.  
 Merton Blackford, Fullerton.  
 John E. Nolan, Jamestown.  
 Charles C. Taylor, Kernville.  
 Michael G. Gallagher, Livermore.  
 Lee Darneal, Los Gatos.  
 Edna M. Sheridan, Montrie.  
 Richard L. Dixon, Newman.  
 John B. Barnard, Niles.  
 William H. Kelly, Palo Alto.  
 George W. Nygren, Parlier.  
 Edgar J. Murphy, Redondo Beach.  
 Louis P. Miller, Rio Vista.  
 Ernest R. Rhymes, Sanitarium.  
 Ralph Cole, Ross.  
 John J. McGrath, San Mateo.  
 Mary G. Mails, San Quentin.  
 George B. Morgridge, Sierra Madre.  
 Earle R. Hawley, Stockton.  
 Virginia Mason, Suisun City.  
 Isidore J. Proulx, Willows.  
 Ora A. Woods, Winters.  
 Harry E. Meyers, Yuba City.

## COLORADO.

Irving P. Beckett, Craig.  
 Anna C. Miller, Crested Butte.  
 Nellie E. Pyles, Fountain.  
 Llewellyn F. Allen, Littleton.  
 Charles V. Engert, Lyons.  
 Edna A. Gates, Sedgwick.  
 William E. King, Sterling.  
 James L. Allison, Woodmen.

## FLORIDA.

Joseph B. Reed, Daytona Beach.  
 Rex Holley, Lake Worth.  
 Richard J. Mays, Monticello.  
 George W. Brown, New Smyrna.  
 Ernest C. Mahaffey, Quincy.

## GEORGIA.

John C. McAuliffe, Augusta.  
 Joel F. Fountain, Ray City.  
 Robert I. Fanning, Washington.  
 James L. Brooks, Austell.  
 Dan A. McMillan, Bartow.  
 Lonnie E. Sweat, Blackshear.  
 Louis J. Leavy, jr., Brunswick.  
 Commodore D. Stewart, Buchanan.  
 Mattie N. Riley, Butler.  
 John B. Crawford, Cairo.  
 Stephen B. Pace, Carrollton.  
 Sam M. Barnett, Chatsworth.  
 William E. Dunham, Cochran.  
 Leland H. Williams, Collegepark.  
 May S. Holmes, Culloden.  
 Paul Latimer, Fairburn.  
 Mary A. Rudisill, Forsyth.  
 Thomas B. Banks, Grantville.  
 James P. McGriff, Hawkinsville.  
 John H. Boone, Hazlehurst.  
 Robert M. Edge, Jasper.  
 Anna C. Williams, Lumpkin.  
 Henry C. Hays, Mansfield.  
 Julian G. Hicks, Reynolds.  
 Edward B. Oxford, Rutledge.

## ILLINOIS.

Walker L. Hylton, Chester.  
 Andrew R. Tarbox, Gibson City.  
 John Wacker, Techny.  
 Arthur Justus, Warren.  
 Thomas W. Daly, Witt.

## IOWA.

Kathryn McGuire, Audubon.  
 Patience Felger, Afton.  
 Charles G. Wiley, Bonaparte.  
 Lloyd S. Meyers, Columbus Junction.  
 Mabel G. Hart, Farragut.  
 Sherman I. Rutledge, Iowa Falls.  
 Charles E. L. See, Laurens.  
 Edward C. Reindl, Manly.  
 Nels A. Jensen, Newell.



Earl E. Houdek, Sigourney.  
Arthur O. Reinhardt, Van Horn.  
Henry G. Kruse, Vinton.

## HAWAII.

William E. Smith, Koloa.  
William C. Irwin, Waialua.

## KANSAS.

George W. Edwards, Alta Vista.  
Charles L. Smith, Baxter Springs.  
Bessie M. Williams, Belle Plaine.  
Jacob H. Hostetler, Belleville.  
George E. Bentley, Burr Oak.  
William A. Morgan, Burrton.  
Thomas A. Stevens, Caney.  
Timothy J. Foley, Chapman.  
James D. Stevenson, Clafin.  
Bessie Young, Dighton.  
John H. Rathbun, Downs.  
Harry J. Davis, Elkhart.  
Alexander Nieruberger, Ellis.  
Edward Grauerholz, Esbon.  
George W. Long, Galena.  
James P. Newman, Galesburg.  
William L. Ringo, Girard.  
Catherine T. Butler, Glasco.  
Daniel G. M. Keen, Greenleaf.  
James L. Reeves, Gridley.  
Vernon L. Durand, Hoisington.  
Burton M. Palmer, Jewell.  
Rodney Torrey, La Crosse.  
Vardie V. Goeden, Lakin.  
Malinda L. Hoerman, Linn.  
Fred N. Adam, Longton.  
Christina Walker, Moline.  
Nell E. Bevans, Mulberry.  
Alexander Burgess, Mulvane.  
Dale Stark, Perry.  
Everett G. Gillidett, Plains.  
Cecil Calvert, Quinter.  
James E. Leach, Randolph.  
Charles E. Van Vleck, Rossville.  
Richard W. Moorhead, Sabetha.  
George A. Pierce, St. Paul.  
John Q. Adams, Stockton.  
Ida T. Willis, Troy.  
Olive Green, Whiting.  
William M. Stehley, Woodston.

## KENTUCKY.

Tarleton C. Hobbs, Anchorage.  
Cyrus M. Preston, Ashland.  
Mattie L. Harris, Auburn.  
Joe Ely, Benton.  
Garland G. Lanum, Fordsville.  
Judith W. Montgomery, Greensburg.  
Archie A. Bridwell, Jeffersonton.  
John T. Wickersham, Lebanon Junction.  
J. Walter Payne, Paris.  
Roland T. Huffman, Pikeville.  
William A. Dickinson, Trenton.  
James L. Chadwick, Vanceburg.

## LOUISIANA.

Emile Aubert, Abita Springs.  
Albert Nunez, Arabi.  
Jesse A. Melton, Coushatta.  
Susie Jones, Glenmora.  
Edith E. Steckler, Jeanerette.  
Octave H. Deshotels, Kaplan.  
Charlton Fort, Minden.  
John T. Bryant, Monroe.  
Clair M. Cazayonx, New Roads.

## MARYLAND.

Wilmer L. Barnes, Bel Air.  
Rose C. Foreman, Emmitsburg.  
John B. Sweeney, Hagerstown.  
William T. McPherson, La Plata.  
Frank J. Shriner, Union Bridge.  
Oscar S. Barrick, Woodsboro.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

William P. Lovejoy, Barnstable.  
Joseph F. Murrman, Clinton.  
J. William Byron, Concord.  
William M. Allen, Fairhaven.

James H. Hoar, Fall River.  
James E. Sullivan, Gilbertville.  
Edmund Daly, Hingham.  
James J. Murtaugh, Hopkinton.  
John A. Bell, Leicester.  
John F. Williams, Marblehead.  
Arthur J. Coughlan, Maynard.  
Perry F. Brown, Northampton.  
William W. McLehose, Norton.  
Thomas F. Meehan, Orange.  
John P. O'Connor, Palmer.  
John Adams, Provincetown.  
Joseph L. McGrath, Sharon.  
Nancy S. Harley, South Hanson.  
Charles T. Farrell, Stoughton.  
Stephen C. Luce, Vineyard Haven.  
John P. McKay, Wellfleet.  
Martin Ratigan, Whitman.  
Charles W. Swift, Yarmouth Port.

## MICHIGAN.

Roy P. Hallock, Almont.  
Ephraim S. Reist, Ashley.  
James Cotter, Auburn.  
Arthur E. Dann, Beaverton.  
William P. Nisbett, Big Rapids.  
Miles L. Hadsall, Birch Run.  
Clio S. Case, Brighton.  
Myron B. Gallagher, Byron.  
Nathan C. Thomas, Caledonia.  
Frank D. McCaren, Carsonville.  
Edwin L. Groger, Concord.  
Jerry S. Walling, Coopersville.  
Thomas T. Fralick, Copemish.  
David R. Brown, Deckerville.  
Charles H. Hudkins, East Jordan.  
William L. Ferry, Eau Claire.  
Alfred F. Skarritt, Edmore.  
Harry F. Brainard, Elsie.  
Helen A. Collier, Gaylord.  
Robert E. Vickers, Gobleville.  
Edward J. Marrinane, Grass Lake.  
Harold Murphy, Harbor Beach.  
William H. Blashfield, Hartford.  
Archie D. Himebaugh, Hesperia.  
Fred J. O'Melay, Hillsdale.  
William O. Van Eyck, Holland.  
Patrick J. Scanlan, Hubbell.  
George M. Hubbard, Hudsonville.  
Samuel Folz, Kalamazoo.  
Edward D. Ahearn, Kinde.  
Charles Hunter, Marlette.  
Andrew H. Campbell, Mattawan.  
Elmer Bremer, Montgomery.  
Frederick W. Richter, Niles.  
Patrick F. Heenan, North Branch.  
Thomas Maveety, Olivet.  
James A. Hull, Oscoda.  
William G. White, Ovid.  
Alva McCarty, Oxford.  
Albert Steinen, Painesdale.  
Riley L. Compton, Rockford.  
Charles Powers, Saugatuck.  
Harry M. Royal, Shelby.  
Evert S. Dyckman, South Haven.  
Paul D. Palmer, Sunfield.  
Charles L. Bennett, Thompsonville.  
Emanuel Wilhelm, Traverse City.  
Fred Gibbs, White Cloud.  
Will A. Flinn, Whitehall.

## MINNESOTA.

Joseph F. Ashbaugh, Murdock.

## MISSISSIPPI.

Will N. Guyton, Blue Mountain.  
Emma L. Whyte, Bond.  
Benjamin F. Hill, Canton.  
George S. Neal, Clinton.  
Harry L. Callicott, Coldwater.  
Minnie Davis, Duncan.  
William C. Tyler, Duck Hill.  
Mary L. Tatum, Edwards.  
Cornelius T. Sweatt, Ethel.  
Bennett A. Truly, Fayette.  
Malcolm S. Graham, Forest.

Mary F. Johnston, Friar Point.  
 Jefferson D. Fogg, Hernando.  
 Robert B. Waldrop, Houston.  
 Walter W. Holmes, McComb.  
 Hugh M. Drane, McCool.  
 James L. Copper, Maben.  
 Thirza I. Clarke, Marks.  
 Maggie E. Sullivan, Meadville.  
 Hubert R. Tatum, Merigold.  
 William T. Smith, New Albany.  
 Thaddeus C. Barrier, Philadelphia.  
 Robert W. Magruder, Port Gibson.  
 Coke B. Wier, Quitman.  
 Tamora C. Epperson, Raymond.  
 John A. Smallwood, Ripley.  
 Tommie A. Hamill, Sturgis.  
 James H. Crawford, Tylertown.  
 Andrew V. Lamar, Vardaman.

## MISSOURI.

Carl E. Davis, Ewing.  
 William W. Reese, Ironton.  
 Essie Ward, King City.  
 Alma C. Dobbins, Laredo.  
 Clate Cox, Princeton.  
 Arthur C. Jones, Queen City.  
 Arthur L. Wilson, Waynesville.

## MONTANA.

Alban C. Sipe, Broadview.  
 Philip B. C. Goodwin, Butte.  
 Thomas Dowen, Chinook.  
 John P. Heaton, Dodson.  
 Frank K. Hollenbeck, Forsyth.  
 Fred B. Hedge, Grassrange.  
 Carl E. Bowman, Hardin.  
 Charles E. Mullikin, Hingham.  
 Maurice J. Keenan, Hobson.  
 Joseph A. Lemire, Ronan.  
 Bernelda A. Miller, Terry.  
 John C. Tipton, White Sulphur Springs.

## NEBRASKA.

Melvin A. Brinegar, Alexandria.  
 Loren W. Harper, Allen.  
 James C. Badger, Arlington.  
 William C. Rosecrans, Ashland.  
 Garrett H. Lorenz, Ashton.  
 William S. Morgan, Atkinson.  
 John H. Grosvenor, Aurora.  
 Xander Y. Zuhlke, Bancroft.  
 Martin G. Doering, Battle Creek.  
 Harry A. Crosby, Beemer.  
 Calvin A. Demarest, Bethany.  
 Thomas J. Lane, Bloomington.  
 John W. Henthorn, Blue Springs.  
 William F. Nick, Cedar Bluffs.  
 Benjamin A. Brewster, Chadron.  
 Francis A. Thompson, Clay Center.  
 Charles A. Payne, Clearwater.  
 Louis H. Deaver, Cody.  
 James M. Crews, Culbertson.  
 Thomas J. Hinds, David City.  
 George W. Nicholas, De Witt.  
 William A. Nyrop, Elgin.  
 Daniel Kavanaugh, Fairbury.  
 Owen T. Thompson, Farnam.  
 John Wilson, Franklin.  
 Henry P. Wilson, Geneva.  
 Samuel A. Tobey, Gresham.  
 Patrick J. Melia, Gretna.  
 Orla C. Lamb, Guide Rock.  
 Ethel Chubb, Haigler.  
 James R. Durrie, Laurel.  
 William C. Rusmisell, Mason City.  
 Edwin C. Pickett, Mullen.  
 Grover C. Hoback, Nehawka.  
 Oscar E. Swanson, Oakland.  
 John J. McCarthy, Ogallala.  
 Michael H. McCarthy, O'Neill.  
 Thomas O. Norman, Oxford.  
 Anton B. Helms, Randolph.  
 Otto S. Larson, Shickley.  
 George M. Sandusky, Sterling.  
 Emmor C. Ratcliff, Stratton.  
 Anthony R. Kovanda, Table Rock.

William D. Day, Ulysses.  
 Carl Carlson, Valparaiso.  
 Ernest J. Kaltenborn, Waco.  
 Carl P. Lundgren, Wausa.  
 David D. O'Kane, Wood River.  
 Charles F. Gilbert, York.

## NEVADA.

Edna M. George, Battle Mountain.  
 George W. Likes, Fallon.  
 Mildred Robison, Overton.  
 James J. McQuillan, Tonopah.  
 Michael E. Nevin, Virginia City.  
 Merritt A. Macfarlane, Winnemucca.

## NEW JERSEY.

Katherine A. Cooney, Pedricktown.

## NEW YORK.

Louis W. Noland, Saratoga Springs.  
 Walter C. Burton, Brooklyn.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

Miley C. Glover, Bailey.  
 L. Estelle Jones, Bethel.  
 James P. Parker, Blue Ridge.  
 William C. Gillespie, Burnsville.  
 Frank R. Mease, Canton.  
 John F. Hunsucker, Conover.  
 Millard F. Bond, Edenton.  
 Martin L. Fogleman, Gibsonville.  
 Everette R. Crawford, Hayesville.  
 James J. Farriss, High Point.  
 George K. Snow, Mount Airy.  
 Sarah L. Whitson, Oteen.  
 William R. Badgett, Pilot Mountain.  
 Luther F. Tillery, Rocky Mount.  
 Frank W. Miller, Waynesville.

## OHIO.

Albert E. Kroske, Arlington.  
 Lee R. Carman, Belmont.  
 Oscar D. Ellenwood, Belpre.  
 James M. Phillips, Bethesda.  
 Fred H. Hart, Beverly.  
 Gideon Locher, Bluffton.  
 Thomas M. Duncan, Bridgeport.  
 Peter J. Blank, Canal Fulton.  
 Augustus S. Tuttle, Creston.  
 William E. Haas, Delaware.  
 John E. McFarland, Dresden.  
 Michael E. Miskall, East Liverpool.  
 Justus D. Smoots, Fredericktown.  
 James A. Angus, Genoa.  
 Frederick B. Mowery, Kingston.  
 George M. Galbraith, Lexington.  
 Homer G. Hansel, Logan.  
 Lewis G. Barton, Millersburg.  
 Robert L. Hagerty, Mingo Junction.  
 Karl H. Sherman, Minster.  
 Charles W. Hodges, Mount Sterling.  
 Franklin Harper, Mount Vernon.  
 Daniel A. Muskoff, Navarre.  
 John I. Norris, New Matamoras.  
 James B. Beard, Newton Falls.  
 Alfred L. Richar, Niles.  
 William H. Flach, Piqua.  
 Claren T. Shively, Rogers.  
 Ross S. DeMuth, Rossford.  
 Henry H. McFadden, Steubenville.  
 George W. Lathrop, Toledo.  
 James Connor, Toronto.  
 Charles H. Dale, Troy.  
 Glenn B. Rodgers, Washington Court House.  
 Theresia M. Beacham, Williamsburg.  
 Thomas N. Swearingen, Winchester.  
 Harry E. Rice, Xenia.

## OREGON.

John W. Leneve, Coquille.  
 Katherine B. Veatch, Cottage Grove.  
 Chester Noland, Creswell.  
 Warren A. Heylman, Estacada.  
 Robert P. Wirtz, Forest Grove.  
 William P. Quinlan, Grants Pass.  
 Homer S. Wood, Independence.  
 Fitzhugh G. Lee, Junction City.  
 Walter L. Hembree, McMinnville.



James A. Watkins, Philomath.  
Joseph Lyons, Reedsport.  
Oscar Kendall, Richland.  
James W. Dunn, St. Benedict.  
Frank H. Loughton, Seaside.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

Louise Martin, Koppel.  
William M. Carter, Punxsutawney.  
Matthew Storey, South Brownsville.

## PORTO RICO.

Carlos F. Torregrosa, Aguadilla.

## RHODE ISLAND.

Samuel W. Smith, jr., Jamestown.  
Emory H. Desilets, Manville.  
Frank P. Lamb, Natick.  
Sumner Mowry, Peace Dale.  
Howard F. Briggs, jr., Saunderstown.  
John McPike, Warren.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

James M. Byrd, Branchville.  
Clinton G. Rowland, Central.  
James A. Barrett, Clover.  
Clara A. Bonner, Due West.  
Almon C. Turbeville, Lake City.  
Maxcy J. Spears, Lamar.  
John W. Willis, Lynchburg.  
Ellen M. Williamson, Norway.  
William B. Wright, jr., Shelton.  
Marie C. Harley, Williston.  
Bruce K. Arnold, Woodruff.  
Martha E. Nichols, York.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

Dana N. Bonesteel, Artesian.  
Raymond B. Breed, Brookings.  
Guy A. Miller, Conde.  
Edward McDonald, Deadwood.  
Frank E. Riley, Dupree.  
Lydia Oldewurtel, Freeman.  
John A. Stromme, Garretson.  
Anna M. Damberger, Herreid.  
James S. Slaughter, Herrick.  
Harry K. Sanborn, Hurley.  
Tazewell M. Simmons, Huron.  
Frelen Riley, Parker.  
Francis M. Crain, Redfield.  
Leroy F. Lemert, Spencer.  
James E. Burns, Timber Lake.  
James R. Dunlap, Vermilion.  
James M. Rasmussen, Viborg.  
John W. Martin, Watertown.

## TENNESSEE.

Charles M. Reed, Athens.  
John I. Cox, Bristol.  
Shadrach E. Byler, Collinwood.  
Richard H. Green, Covington.  
Charles C. Berry, Dyer.  
Hugh H. Gouchenour, Greeneville.  
James S. Pritchett, Jonesboro.  
Mary B. Buford, Lynnville.  
Dossie O. Thompson, McEwen.  
James C. Walker, Monterey.  
John M. Jones, Newport.  
Leander N. Alley, Oakdale.  
S. R. Robinson, Tazewell.

## TEXAS.

Albert B. Seale, Beaumont.  
William L. Hayley, Bronte.  
Hugh M. Bryan, Burton.  
Rudolph Flach, jr., Comfort.  
Harvey E. Williams, Desdemona.  
Howell L. Piner, Denison.  
Henry C. Bailey, Detroit.  
William R. Dickens, Eden.  
Walter N. Ramsay, Eldorado.  
James H. Richey, Hedley.  
Willis D. Holman, Hutto.  
Theodore W. Lueders, Lagrange.  
Wilson B. Russell, Liberty Hill.  
Otto J. Lang, Lufkin.  
Percy L. Walker, Luling.  
Charles J. January, jr., McAllen.

Mary R. Manning, Madisonville.  
Claud W. Warren, Matador.  
George F. Nelson, Mount Calm.  
Edgar A. Stripling, Mount Vernon.  
Joseph W. Holland, New Waverly.  
Osceola G. Wilson, Nixon.  
Abundio Contreras, Rio Grande.  
Mary M. Ferrel, Roby.  
Herschel C. Connally, Rosebud.  
Roy C. Lattimore, Roxton.  
James W. Longley, San Saba.  
Virgil T. Williams, Thornton.  
Wiley H. Lowrey, Weimar.  
Charles P. Zapalac, West.  
Aaron H. Russell, Willis.

## UTAH.

Robert D. Halladay, Grantsville.  
Heber J. Sheffield, jr., Kaysville.  
Jedediah M. Blair, Logan.  
Richard T. Fry, Morgan.  
William S. Anderson, Moroni.  
George A. Allen, Nephi.  
Leonard C. Sargent, Panguitch.  
William A. Jones, Spanish Fork.

## VERMONT.

Alfred A. Durkee, Pittsford.  
Claude C. Duval, West Burke.

## VIRGINIA.

William G. Stevenson, Accomac.  
Nannie B. Campbell, Amherst.  
A. Sidney Francis, Boykins.  
Everett S. Kendrick, Bristol.  
Sidney Sheltman, Christiansburg.  
Henry L. Munt, City Point.  
Eugene C. Hurt, Clover.  
Ruth C. Mankin, Falls Church.  
Robert L. Dudley, Rural Retreat.  
Samuel R. Gault, Scottsville.  
William A. Coates, South Washington.  
John L. Henley, Tappahannock.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Samuel A. Christie, Keystone.  
William A. Burgess, St. Albans.  
Charles G. Price, Smithfield.

## WISCONSIN.

George Crawford, Mineral Point.

## REJECTION.

*Executive nomination rejected by the Senate June 4, 1920.*

## POSTMASTER.

## ALABAMA.

John M. Parrish, Clanton.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, June 4, 1920.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Great Spirit, through whose wisdom, power, and goodness Thou didst bring order out of chaos in a vast and stupendous universe, of which we are a part, and who hast created us to fulfill a destiny so grand, noble, and holy, of which we have not thought or dreamed.

We are finite, Thou art infinite; we are weak, Thou art mighty; we know but little, Thou knowest all things.

Let Thy influence be upon us, to guide us on our way toward that goal which is manifest in the incomparable life, character, and teachings of Thy Son Jesus Christ, our Lord and Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, at Grant's Tomb on Decoration Day I had the honor of making some remarks, and I ask unanimous consent to extend them in the RECORD, with the assurance